

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

'RELIGION never answers all your questions for you. Most of them you carry with you throughout life. Some of them drop into places of secondary importance, and others you get a little more light on as you go along.' There is an honest ring about words like these, which wakes an echo in the hearts of men who are suspicious of dogmatism, and we are ready to listen to the certainties of a man who is willing to confess that even religion has not furnished him with complete answers to all his questions.

---

The words quoted are taken from a book entitled *Things and Persons: A Study in the Meaning of Life*, by Mr. J. Eric FENN (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net), and part of its charm is that it is autobiographical; the writer has attained—if not to certainty, at any rate to peace and joy, and he writes that others may enter into the open secret which he has discovered. He indicates the general lines along which his own mind has been working, and suggests 'some of the more important things which I have found for myself; for the rest the reader must seek for himself.'

---

His book, like Streeter's, though on a much smaller scale, is an attempt to understand the nature of reality. How are we to interpret the world—the world of our experience and the universe of which we form a part? What is at the heart of it? Or are we to say, Who is at the heart of it? Is there a personal God? Mr. Fenn is well

aware of the extreme difficulty for the modern man of thinking of God in terms of personality. Indeed, there are multitudes who never think of God at all: 'We face a world to-day where religion itself is alien to the mind and heart of a great number of people.' And till comparatively recently, science did not make it easy for men to believe in a personal God. In famous words, that was 'a hypothesis for which they had no need.' How can the sense of that need be recovered by those who lament its loss or attained by those who have never felt it?

---

Mr. FENN does not begin with Jesus. Apparently that is not the way by which he himself has come—at any rate, not the point from which he started. He begins with the world as he finds it; and he finds in it—as surely in our deeper moments we all do—not only molecules and atoms and electrons, but values. We recognize that there are things 'that seem to be perceived or experienced at a deeper level of life than pure reason.' What of Truth, and Beauty, and Goodness? Does any one really believe that Beauty is nothing more than vibration? These things are not only facts, they are values; and if they are values, have they no relation to the ultimate structure of life, to reality?

---

Mr. FENN finds help in the thought that values are *for persons*. The things named—and there are others—are the things by which men live, the things which they reverence and for which they have been ready to make the uttermost sacrifice: they are

the things which give meaning to life and which constitute the deepest life, but they have no meaning apart from persons. 'The facts we have to deal with include the nature and desires of human hearts as much as the spinning of electrons.' So Mr. FENN concludes that 'the only adequate category of thought in relation to the world is personal: otherwise the main facts of personal living are left out. On less than a personal view the cardinal values of life are ultimately meaningless. They depend for their charter on the world being of such a nature that they are of significance in relation to the meaning of the universe,' in the nature of which they are firmly rooted.

He also says very truly that when we meet people who cherish those values, reverence for which is necessary to completeness of personality, we are aware that they are in a sense not alone; they have a source of life that is greater than they; they draw their strength from a hidden power, and their lives speak to us of this greater reality. 'For them, values are delivered from abstraction by being rooted in God, part of the ultimate, personal ground of the universe.'

This being so, we are now in a position to draw closer to the Christian argument. For if there be a personal God, His will and His ways will be best understood and interpreted by the spirits that are most sensitive; if there be a revelation at all, the media of it will be just such as they. It will be the pure in heart who see God and who can tell of Him. 'The most effective channel for God's revelation will be the people who are most spiritually alive to the things that belong to the deepest levels of our experience.'

Now who has been more spiritually alive, and who has touched deeper levels of experience than Jesus? When He said that the pure in heart see God and that they are blessed, He was giving to men a glimpse of *His own* inner life. And so with quietness and confidence the man in quest of the great secret will turn to the story of the life of Jesus. There he will find difficulties—the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, and other things; but let him

not in the meantime linger over these. If he admits, as he surely must, that Jesus was one with the will and purpose of God, 'then there is no difficulty in calling Him the Son of God.' So far as the Resurrection is concerned, Mr. FENN admits that for himself—and many would subscribe to his confession—the most important evidence lies not in the Gospels, but in the history of the early Church, which reveals timid, ordinary, quarrelsome people transformed by faith in a living Lord. They found God through Him.

When we approach the Gospels to form an estimate of Jesus—to judge Him, as it were—we find if we remain with Him long enough that He is judging us; and if we yield ourselves to His spell, we find that He has taken us into a 'new world,' where the simple things of every day are filled with eternal significance, and the traffic of the soul with a personal God becomes the most real of all realities.

Faith in God through Christ is therefore the beginning of a great adventure. It is 'the attitude that determines you to go ahead, on the basis of the beliefs you have, *in order to know*.' It will give us a new joy in nature—for in a fresher sense than ever, this world will be felt to be God's world—a new respect for science, as an attempt to understand one part of the mind of God, and a new reverence for our fellow-men and women as sons and daughters of God, whom it would be nothing less than a crime to use as instruments for procuring our own profit or pleasure.

'We are still living in an age which, I think, our successors will one day look back upon with curiosity and wonder as an age characterised especially by physical realism—an age strangely blind in some, but by no means all, respects to what will then appear as outstanding spiritual reality, and concealing this behind scientific abstractions which it had taken for representation of reality and proceeded to bow down before, though they were its own creations. In this respect I think our age will be regarded as an idolatrous one, although our



idols are of a different kind from those of relatively uncivilised peoples. The idolatry pervades not only scientific thought, but also, as it seems to me, theology. We have accustomed ourselves to believe at the same time in the reality of a material and a spiritual world, without realising that these two beliefs are ultimately inconsistent with one another.'

---

This sweeping criticism of the thought of our time is uttered by Professor J. S. HALDANE, C.H., F.R.S., M.D., in his *Donnellan Lectures*, now published under the title of *The Philosophical Basis of Biology* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). Professor HALDANE has been a lifelong champion of a spiritual view of reality. A scientist of the first rank, he has what so many scientists lack—a thorough philosophic training and aptitude of mind. If he is outspoken and deals very shrewd blows at the materialists he may be excused. For he has lived through a mechanistic age when the purely physical explanation of reality was dominant and impatient of contradiction, an age when it seemed that the advancing tide of physical science must inevitably submerge the whole realm of the spiritual. He has lived to see the turn of the tide and the frank acknowledgment on the part of leading physicists that reality is not to be explained in terms of the physical. He can now twit one of the mechanistic die-hards with 'standing on a burning deck whence others have fled or are preparing to flee,' and he is free to point out that the root of the error lay in bad metaphysics. 'The manner in which, since the time of Galileo, Descartes, and Newton, European culture got into the grip of bad metaphysics, when men supposed that they were freeing themselves from metaphysics and going back to facts, is something which future generations will laugh over; and particularly over ideas at present current as to what science or "exact science" is.'

---

Professor HALDANE has chosen to treat of the philosophic basis of biology for two reasons. First, biology, or more strictly physiology, is his own special subject, on which he can speak with authority and in which he can trace out with the minuteness of an expert what is implied in the structure and functions

of a living thing. And secondly, it is here that physics and chemistry cross the border in the attempted invasion of higher regions. Their attempt is to explain life in physico-chemical terms, and having accomplished this they would advance farther to explain spirit and personality in the same terms. This attack may best be met in the realm of biology, where it is possible to show with scientific precision that, however science may be blinded meantime by idolatry of physical realism, life is not to be explained in terms of mechanism. 'I think that a realisation of the axioms on which biology is based will do a great deal to turn us from our idolatry, and do it perhaps more effectively because it brings us straight up against physical realism, in so direct a manner that there can be no evasion of the issue involved. Once we are in this way brought to see the impossibility of physical realism, further insight will follow much more easily.'

---

The fundamental axiom of biology is the existence of life. 'It is life that we are studying in biology, and not phenomena which can be represented by the causal connections of physics and chemistry.' Each part of a living organism depends from moment to moment on its active relations with neighbouring parts and with the surrounding environment, but all are so co-ordinated that the specific unity and continuity of a life are maintained. The whole situation cannot reasonably be accounted for except as the expression of life. Professor HALDANE illustrates this by an elaborate discussion of the physiology of breathing, in which he shows that 'we cannot study with any success the physiology of breathing without at the same time studying the lives of organisms as wholes, and the distinctive language which a physiologist uses, such as "breathing" or "respiration," is a testimony to this. The whole which is studied is, moreover, no mere aggregate of separable units and events, but is constantly showing its indivisible nature by adaptation from moment to moment to varying circumstances.' This adaptation, which can be tested and verified experimentally, demonstrates the reality of the living whole. 'It is always to the conception of life as whole that we are driven forwards!'



This does not imply the doctrine of the so-called vitalist. Professor HALDANE firmly rejects vitalism, though he has often been regarded as a vitalist. Vitalism has the same fundamental defect as the mechanistic theory of life. It assumes that a living organism and its environment can be separated in observation and thought when they cannot be separated. For a similar reason he rejects the idea of emergent evolution which seems to imply that the first and fundamental reality is a physical world of dead matter into which life comes, or out of which life emerges, as an alien and mysterious thing. We begin by postulating such a world, and then we go on to speak of 'the mystery of life.' There is no peculiar mystery about life; it is there in its own right. If it be objected that there must have been a time when there was no life, and when, therefore, life must have arisen in some way out of physical and chemical conditions, the reply is that this is by no means so apparent as it seemed a generation ago. 'It is only an assumption of what we might call the Newtonian metaphysics that there must have been a time when there was no life. However low down we may go in the scale of life, and however far back we may trace the development of life, it is still life that we find.' Moreover, the new physics has revealed in the constitution of the atom a structure and co-ordination which seem more of the nature of organism than of mechanism. 'Behind the Newtonian conception of physical reality there has loomed up at every point a deeper conception which is not alien to the biological assumption. Hence there is now no difficulty in assuming that life is not a mere product of physical and chemical conditions as represented on Newtonian principles, but corresponds to what is more primary than these conditions, and has always been there.'

This vindication of life as a fundamental datum of biology naturally leads on to a similar vindication of consciousness and personality. 'The phenomena of conscious behaviour take us into a differently interpreted world from that of biological interpretation, just as biological phenomena take us into a differently interpreted world from that of the physical sciences or mathematics. Hence

biology does not, and cannot, deal with psychologically interpreted phenomena, but can only treat the phenomena it deals with as if psychological phenomena did not exist, or could be left entirely out of consideration.' Our perceived world is no mere picture independent of our presence in it, but is the embodiment of our personal interest which reaches back over the past and forward to the future, so that past and future are represented in the present. Our perception as well as our voluntary actions are the expression of our personality. 'We are responsible no less for the motives which appeal to us than for the actions with which they are bound up. Greed for another man's money is no excuse for robbery, but an admission of a very mean sort of guilt.' We are only putting meaningless words together if we endeavour to express conscious activity as nothing but either physiological activity or physical activity plus a mysterious accompaniment of consciousness.

The final point to which the analysis of our experience leads is not to a world of separate self-centred personalities, but to a certain unity of spiritual perception and interest; in other words, to a universe which is a manifestation of God. 'God is the Personality of personalities. In so far as our perceptions and actions can be identified with the perceptions and corresponding actions of God they correspond with reality; and the presence of God within us inspires the effort to test and realise in our lives the correspondence.' This is the faith of religion. 'We are immortal, free, and one with those who have gone before us and will follow after us, not as mere individuals, but through the presence of God within us. . . . It is neither consistent with religion nor with our actual experience to regard ourselves as nothing more than a series of obscure happenings on an obscure planet in a gigantic physical universe. Our universe is not outside of us, because we are not outside of God, and the universe is the progressive manifestation of God. This is the basis of religion; and however often religion may be obscured by mistaken scientific metaphysics or buried in equally mistaken theology, it will return in ever clearer form to guide and inspire humanity as it has done to such an

extent in the past, in spite of the baseless superstitions which have often been associated with it.'

---

The question of spiritual healing has come very much to the front in recent years, and that for various reasons. The intimate connexion of body and mind, and their influence upon one another is increasingly realized. The explorations of the subconscious by the new psychology have brought to light a vast number of unsuspected possibilities of influencing life and health. The practice of spiritual healing by various methods has produced a record of successes which, when every reasonable deduction is made, is undeniably impressive. At the same time it is so frequently allied with much that is superstitious and absurd that there is in many minds a very natural hesitation to give the subject serious consideration.

---

It cannot be denied, however, that the subject is of sufficient importance to merit careful study, especially on the part of those who have the cure of souls and the guidance of the policy of the Church. An eminently wise book on the whole subject has been issued under the title of *Body, Mind and Spirit*, by the Rev. Elwood WORCESTER, M.A., Ph.D., D.D., and the Rev. Samuel McCOMB, M.A., D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net), and it merits the warmest commendation. Nearly a quarter of a century ago these two writers, in co-operation with Dr. Coriat, a medical expert, gave an account of a remarkable ministry of healing which they carried on in Boston and which became widely known as 'The Emmanuel Movement.' What distinguished this work from other healing cults was its frank recognition of Science and Religion as the great controlling forces of human life and the attempt to bring these two forces into intimate and helpful association. 'To the combination of these motives,' writes Dr. WORCESTER, 'the scientific and the spiritual, I ascribe what I may or may not be pardoned for regarding as the superiority of our results and the permanence of improvement in innumerable cases which had found no relief through other modes of treatment.'

This work has been continued up to the present with undiminished success. 'From the beginning we have associated ourselves with competent medical men and surgeons. Indeed, had such co-operation been refused, we should not have dreamed of assuming responsibility for the sick in mind and body. For many years most of our patients have been sent us by physicians, and in all cases which involved more than the need of moral and spiritual advice we have left no stone unturned to procure the best diagnosis and medical care obtainable.'

---

In the present volume the writers review the whole field, particularly in the light which the new psychology has recently thrown upon it. This review is marked, as their previous work was, by great sanity of judgment and deep spiritual intuition united in a remarkable degree with shrewd common sense. The exposition is clear and practical, and is illustrated throughout by a number of cases, the record of which is impressive, and at times astonishing. Much of it is more easily credible to-day than it was twenty-five years ago, through the revelations which have been made by Freud and others on the profound depth and potency of the subconscious mind. Freud never idealized the subconscious mind. On the contrary, he seemed to regard it as 'a kind of limbo of rejected ideas, as a part of our mind in which painful experiences, condemned desires, conflicts which have torn and harmed us, lie buried.' There is, doubtless, truth in this, but it does not give a complete or adequate conception of the part which the subconscious plays in human life. As well might the pathologist insist that diseased and wasted bodies represent normal humanity. The subconscious mind is a reservoir of force which may be man's worst enemy or his best friend. In all supremely great men, poets, philosophers, discoverers, there is an element of divination or intuition, which springs from the subconscious, to which so many of them have testified. In all true love there is a preponderating subconscious, non-rational basis. In every form of religion there is a numinal, non-rational element, and it is in this sphere that the most characteristic



phenomena of religion—a sense of the Holy, faith, awe, mystery, rapture, fear, love—take place.

In this obscure region lie the hidden springs of life and health. Here profound disturbances may occur which have a disastrous effect on the body, inducing an almost endless variety of ills. A large class of bodily ailments refuse to yield to ordinary medical treatment because the seat of the trouble lies deeper than drugs can reach, and mental healing must precede or accompany physical. Freud and his followers have brought to this problem a psychology which is dynamic instead of static, and have used the methods of psycho-analysis, sublimation, and transfer. Dr. WORCESTER, while critical of many of the details of the Freudian psychology, finds the teaching capable of bearing a Christian meaning, and sees in 'transfer' a synonym for Christian faith. Among the multitudes of cases treated by him there are a few which he feels impelled to classify as cases of demon-possession. Knowing that the recognition of this possibility will expose him to reproach, he fortifies himself by quoting the opinions of Kant and William James, both of whom accepted this hypothesis. Ten cases are enumerated, and the evidence adduced is of a weighty kind. Most of these cases were of people who had dabbled with automatic writing, and a warning is given against the practice.

All this has an obvious bearing on the healing works of Jesus recorded in the Gospels. There is less disposition to explain them away to-day than there was a generation ago, because the possibility of them is now more clearly recognized. 'The man of medicine sees only one thing, an organism out of harmony with its environment, a maladjustment, a condition of things opposed to the order of Nature. There is something out of joint, it is his function to set it right. Jesus attacks the evil from the mental and spiritual side, and modern medical science is now prepared to say that in a large group of disorders, His method of attack is the only one that has promise of success.' The question of the casting out of devils as recorded in the Gospels is more in dispute. How did Jesus regard demon-pos-

session? It is to be observed that He acted and spoke as if the phenomenon was real. 'He speaks not to the patient as in other forms of disease; always does He address the demon directly. He even enters into conversation on occasion with the demon or demons, as in the story of the maniac in Gerasa. Now it is a striking fact that the same method is pursued by modern neurologists, when they attempt to cure dissociated personalities. Professor Janet of Paris records a case of demon-possession which he personally treated and which resembled in essential features the cases described in the Gospels.' The usual explanation of Jesus' method, that He humoured the patient or conformed to the beliefs of His time, is a very doubtful hypothesis. It is hardly going too far to say, with Dr. R. J. Campbell, 'If there is one thing almost beyond question to those who know the evidence in these days it is that demon-possession is not only a fact, but a fact of our time as well as of New Testament times.'

In spiritual healing the place of prayer is of first-rate importance. Its power to soothe and encourage is admitted even by those who regard it as simply self-suggestion. But if prayer be held to be merely self-suggestion men will forthwith cease to pray. Prayer is an appeal to some Power above. 'It implies a belief in God as a Power able and willing to help, and apart from that conviction it does not function.' As for intercessory prayer, recent thought tends more and more to break down the walls which had been supposed to shut off rigidly one personality from another. The solidarity of humanity is a truth which experience and science alike are driving home to the hearts and consciences of men. Why, then, should the practice of prayer and the mental attitude inspired by it be regarded askance by medical science if it can be shown that these things are valued allies in the fight against disease? 'Only an irrational materialistic dogma can insist on a negative. It is now an ascertained fact that, other things being equal, the sick person who prays for himself and has others pray for him has a better chance of recovery than he who refuses the hope and stimulus which prayer can bestow. . . . Meantime, a sufferer

from cancer would be ill-advised to postpone an operation or other therapeutic procedures which might prolong or save life. The knowledge and skill of the surgeon or the radium expert is as much the fruit of the inspiring Spirit as is the prayer which wells up from a faithful heart.'

'Here, then, is no question of intruding into the sphere of the physician, but what we must ask is: Ought not the Church to bring to the sufferer what the wise physician wishes for him—a new outlook upon life, a spiritual philosophy, the energising

of faith, a sense of self-control!' In these matters science is powerless, but it is just here that religion can do its finest work. 'It meets man in his loneliness, in the tragic depths of his experience, in his tears and distresses, and gives him mastery over the world, over his own unquiet heart, over depression, trial, failure, over quivering nerves and reeling mind. The Church that surrenders to the lure of economic and social reform and forgets that her commission is first and foremost to man as a spiritual being will eventually be found to have betrayed the cause of religion and of humanity.'

## A New Setting for St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians.<sup>1</sup>

BY PROFESSOR G. S. DUNCAN, D.D., ST. ANDREWS.

MOST of us, I dare say, were trained to believe that St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (and with it we may include the other Epistles of the Imprisonment group, viz. to the Colossians, the Ephesians, and Philemon) was written while the Apostle was a prisoner at Rome. We have pictured him awaiting there the result of his appeal, reconciled indeed 'to depart and be with Christ,' yet sustained with the hope that he will yet be released and enabled to revisit Philippi: meantime his influence is quietly making itself felt among the prætorian soldiers who guard him, and he is able to send greetings from Christian brethren in the imperial palace. This is the setting which has been generally accepted in the Church since the second century, yet I submit that it is altogether a mistaken one. The belief is steadily gaining ground among scholars that wherever these Epistles were written from, they were not written from Rome. In some quarters there is a revival of the difficult hypothesis that some or all of them were written from Cæsarea; but by far the most cogent explanation of them, to my mind, is that they originated in a period of imprisonment (unrecorded in Acts) during Paul's missionary activity in Ephesus and neighbourhood. So far as Philippians is concerned, Goguel in France, Feine and Deissmann in Germany, Bacon and

Kirsopp Lake in America are among those who support its Ephesian origin.

It may seem over-bold to challenge a view which has been traditionally accepted for eighteen centuries. It is right, however, to remember that while the correct tradition was likely to be preserved regarding the Church to which any particular Epistle was addressed, it would not be difficult for mistaken ideas to arise at quite an early date regarding the place *from* which an Epistle was sent. And in the case of Philippians it would not be surprising if the references to the prætorium (1<sup>13</sup>) and to Cæsar's household (4<sup>22</sup>) helped in a vague way to create the impression that the letter was written from Rome. Yet to those who have some knowledge of Roman provincial administration it is incontrovertible that these two references need have nothing whatsoever to do with the imperial capital. For the prætorium was in any province the name given to the headquarters of the governor—what we might call The Residency; and under the general term *familia Caesaris* were grouped those civil servants charged by the Emperor to supervise his private interests.

### I. THE GENERAL HISTORICAL SETTING.

If the Imprisonment Epistles are to be assigned to the Ephesian period, some attempt must be

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at the St. Andrews School of Theology, 1931.



made to reconstruct that period so that the various Epistles, together with the Epistles to the Corinthians, may each be seen in its true setting. This is one of the tasks which I have essayed in my recent book, *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry*, where I have developed the view that despite the silence of Acts (which I think can be explained), Paul suffered at this time, under the pressure of a Jewish hostility bent on securing his destruction, a succession of imprisonments—hence that boast about 'in prisons more abundantly' in an Epistle written soon after he left Ephesus (2 Co 11<sup>23</sup>). One of these imprisonments probably followed on the Demetrius riot near the end of the Ephesian period (March 55)—it involved, however, little more than an enforced restraint on his missionary activity, and during it the Apostle wrote Philemon, Colossians, and the circular letter which we call Ephesians. But in the summer of the previous year (after approximately two years spent at Ephesus) there had been a much more serious crisis, and it is with this that we are here more definitely concerned, for it was then, I believe, that Philippians was written. Any reconstruction of that crisis must necessarily be tentative. I believe, however, that just as at Corinth the Jews sought to secure Paul's condemnation before a Roman tribunal on the ground that he was propagating a form of religion which Rome did not sanction, so now at Ephesus they tried to persuade the Roman governor that Paul was guilty of sacrilege<sup>1</sup> by diverting money normally contributed by the Jews in Asia for the support of the Temple in Jerusalem. In view of Imperial edicts, still preserved, addressed by Rome to the authorities at Ephesus and guaranteeing the inviolability of the Jewish Temple-offerings, this charge was one which the Roman governor was bound to treat with great seriousness, and for a time Paul's life was in grave danger. Was it then that the cry arose that he should be flung to the beasts in the arena<sup>2</sup> (1 Co 15<sup>32</sup>)? In the end, however, the proconsul<sup>3</sup> must have dismissed the charge, and Paul was set at liberty.

<sup>1</sup> Temple robbery: cf. how shortly after this the town-clerk declares emphatically that Paul and his associates are *not* temple-robbers (Ac 19<sup>37</sup>).

<sup>2</sup> On the present reconstruction Philippians was written a few weeks or months before 1 Corinthians.

<sup>3</sup> In the year 54 the proconsul of Asia was Junius Silanus. In the same year he was poisoned as being a dangerous rival to Nero (Tacitus, *Annals*, xiii, 1). Have we here perhaps an explanation why Acts omits all mention of Paul's appearance before him?

## II. PAUL'S CIRCUMSTANCES AT THE TIME OF WRITING.

After his arrest Paul would frequently be brought for examination before the Roman governor; it may even have been that he was confined in some part of the headquarters' buildings. Hence we can understand how, more especially after the baselessness of the charge became apparent, his case attracted attention among all those connected with the Residency (1<sup>13</sup>), and how the Apostle, who meantime was cut off from intercourse with the main body of Christians in Ephesus, was able in his letter to say that the Christians on Cæsar's administrative staff at Ephesus wished to send greetings to their Christian confrères in Philippi. The gravity of the crisis was already known to the Philippians, and Paul does not need to dwell on it; but phrase after phrase in his letter shows how profoundly it had affected his whole outlook. That awesome metaphor in 2<sup>17</sup> ('if my life-blood should be poured out as a libation') does not require a Roman prison for its explanation: his experiences at Ephesus had brought home to the Apostle that Jewish hostility would be satisfied with nothing short of his death. From now onwards, as we see both in the Imprisonment Epistles and in those addressed to Corinth, death is an ever-present reality to him: 'I die daily' is a phrase he uses soon after this (1 Co 15<sup>31</sup>). He has come to see, as in a vision, that he is treading the same path as his Divine Master, and that he may be called upon to magnify Christ not merely by his life, but also by his death (1<sup>20</sup>). That being so, he would be quite happy if the hour of his departure should come now: since Christ is the be-all and end-all of his life, to be taken to Christ's nearer presence would be gain. Nevertheless, like the great-heart that he is, he realizes that there is work still waiting for him to do, and he makes bold to say that he knows of a surety that he will be preserved so that that work may go on (1<sup>21-26</sup>). Hence it is that, though for the present a prisoner, he hopes, as soon as the situation becomes clearer, to send Timothy as his envoy to Philippi (2<sup>19, 23</sup>), and later to be free to proceed there himself (2<sup>24</sup>). Here we come to one of the most telling pieces of evidence in favour of the Ephesian origin of the Epistle, for these prospective journeys, firstly of Timothy, and then of the Apostle, coincide exactly with the journeys westwards from Ephesus which are outlined in Ac 19<sup>21, 22</sup>, and also (for the journeys to Philippi and to Corinth were parts of one general advance) in 1 Co 4<sup>17, 19</sup> 16<sup>5, 10</sup>. Apart from this



coincidence in detail we may ask whether, on a broad view of the case, it is not more probable that this proposed visit to Philippi was part of Paul's plan of consolidation in his advance from East to West than that in Rome his thoughts were occupied with a return visit to the East (contrast the hope of going on from Rome to Spain, Ro 15<sup>28</sup>). It is noteworthy, too, that it is at this point (near the close of the Ephesian ministry) that Acts first makes mention of Paul's decision to go on to Rome. It is not impossible that the thought of such a visit was present to the mind of the Apostle before this, but if so the thought has now become a fixed determination: 'I *must* see Rome' (Ac 19<sup>21</sup>). It is surely not fanciful to believe that it was his sense of Roman justice experienced during the recent crisis at Ephesus, following as that experience did on another though less signal experience at Corinth, that fired Paul with the conviction that he must proceed to Rome and, in the face of Jewish intolerance, secure if possible recognition of Christianity as a *religio licita* within the Empire.

### III. PAUL'S RELATIONS WITH THE PHILIPPIAN CHURCH.

We may now go on to consider the circumstances of the Philippian Church at this time, and the relationships which existed between it and the Apostle. On the Ephesian hypothesis five years have elapsed between the founding of the Church and the writing of the Epistle (after a short stay in Thessalonica, Paul had been in Corinth for perhaps two years: and after visiting Jerusalem and Antioch, he had now been for two years in Ephesus); and so far as we know he had had no opportunity in the interval of revisiting Macedonia. During those years the Philippians had identified themselves in the most intimate way with the work of the Apostle and with the cause of missionary expansion. They had (so the letter tells us) contributed to his support in Thessalonica, *i.e.* immediately after he had left Philippi; when he left Macedonia and went south to Corinth they continued their support, and were indeed the only Church to do so; and shortly before Paul wrote this letter, after an interval when the opportunity had been denied them, they had again been able to express their generosity in a gift brought by Epaphroditus. Is not the whole situation immensely clarified if we see that this latest gift was sent, not to Rome after an interval of some ten years, but to Ephesus after an interval which at the longest was still comparatively short? It is

easy to picture how, when Paul was at Ephesus, news was carried to Philippi first of the quite extraordinary progress of the gospel in Asia (cf. Ac 19<sup>10</sup>), then of the serious set-back, when the Apostle was arrested and lay in danger of his life. The Philippians, always generous despite their poverty, decided that the occasion was one when they must again offer their help. And when they arranged that their gift should be handed over personally by one of their own number, Epaphroditus, the intention probably was, not that Epaphroditus should deliver the gift and immediately return home, but that he should remain with Paul as a missionary representative of the Philippian Church—just as I believe that some months later, moved no doubt by the example of their neighbours in Philippi, the Thessalonians sent Aristarchus (a Jewish Christian) and Demas (a Gentile Christian) as their representatives (Col 4<sup>10, 14</sup>). The story of Epaphroditus' misfortune serves further to support the Ephesian as against the Roman origin of the Epistle. Epaphroditus fell ill, and was unable to stay on with the Apostle; and so Paul who, apart from the difficulties of his own situation, may have purposely refrained from acknowledging the gift until Epaphroditus had sufficiently recovered, now takes occasion to write a letter, which Epaphroditus is probably to take back with him when he goes. Some little time had obviously elapsed since the gift arrived, because not merely has news of Epaphroditus' illness reached Philippi, but word has also come back to Ephesus of the grief which the news had occasioned in the Philippian Church. In all this we have an unmistakable indication of an ease and a frequency of communication between Paul and the Philippians, which without doubt are more naturally explained if he is now, not in distant Rome, but at some place of comparatively easy access on the Asian coast.

In writing to the Philippians Paul is writing to a Church which is bound to him by the closest of personal ties, a Church which, by prayer and practical assistance, has done its utmost in the cause of missionary expansion. No wonder that twice in the opening sentences (1<sup>5, 7</sup>) Paul refers with gratitude and enthusiasm to the 'fellowship' of the Philippians in the furtherance of the gospel.<sup>1</sup> He knows, too, that their great interest in him and his work has taken the form of acute anxiety now that they have heard of the grave danger in which he is involved. Accordingly, the first thing he

<sup>1</sup> Appreciation of their practical help is perhaps also implied by the special reference to deacons among those to whom the letter is addressed (1<sup>1</sup>).



has to say to them, after the opening words of thankfulness and goodwill, is that the apparent setback to the gospel has tended rather to its advance by the increased attention which has been focussed on it, not merely throughout the Prætorium, but indeed everywhere else as well. Paul takes occasion here to add that while some of the brethren have been stirred up to preach Christ with greater intensity and boldness, others, apparently dissociating themselves from him, have made his misfortunes the occasion for preaching in a spirit of partisanship; and with reference to this we may recall how, at this very time, there were factions at Corinth associated with the names of Paul and Peter and Apollos, and similar factions might be expected to exist at Ephesus. We can imagine many at Ephesus asking: Why cannot we have a Christianity that will not provoke persecution?

#### IV. SPECIAL PROBLEMS.

It remains to consider briefly certain special problems of the Epistle.

(a) The Christological passage in ch. 2. Repeatedly in the Epistle Paul appeals to the Philippians to remember their unity in Christ and to sink all selfish interests in seeking the good of one another—it may be that he has heard of the existence of factions at Philippi, or are his warnings based on the experience he is having of factions in the sister churches of Ephesus and Corinth? And in ch. 2, after reminding them that their attitude to one another ought to be the attitude of those who are 'in Christ,' he recalls how Christ Himself, though Divine by nature, appeared in human form, taking on Himself the form of a servant, and stooping even so low as to die on a cross; but God in Him has raised Him up on high, and every power in heaven and earth and hell shall yet bow to Him and call Him Lord. Critics in commenting on what they called the 'advanced Christology' of this passage have sometimes explained it by referring to Philippians as one of the latest (if not indeed the very latest) of the extant letters of Paul. I trust the time will soon come when it will be seen that this so-called advanced Christology, so far from demanding a late date, is the Christology also of Paul's mid-career, nay also is in great measure the Christology of the primitive Christian community. And with regard to the present passage, when in addition to the sublimity of its conceptions we have regard also to its balanced structure and its rhythmical and poetical phrasing, is it not in every way probable that Paul is here quoting from

an early Christian hymn,<sup>1</sup> and that, therefore, all talk of a 'developed Christology' and a 'late date' is quite beside the mark?

(b) The denunciatory passages in ch. 3. In ch. 3, after he had apparently thought of drawing the Epistle to a close, Paul unexpectedly launches out into an impassioned warning against certain people whom he calls 'dogs' and 'workers of evil.' It is quite unnecessary to explain the sudden transition by regarding what follows as originally part of a separate letter. It has suddenly occurred to the Apostle that the same Jewish (and even to some extent Jewish Christian) influences which have brought on him the present trouble in Ephesus are likely soon to make themselves felt in his other Churches farther west. He has good reason for such a fear. 2 Corinthians, written two years after Philippians, shows the havoc which by that time those same influences had accomplished in Corinth. It is not difficult, from a study of the relevant passages in the two Epistles, to see that the 'deceitful workers' who are denounced in 2 Corinthians (11<sup>13</sup>) are in the same category as those against whom an anticipatory warning is issued in Philippians; and in this fact we have another argument for assigning Philippians to the same general period as the Corinthian letters rather than to the later date of the Roman imprisonment.

In the Philippian Church itself there are corrupting influences at work. From 3<sup>18ff.</sup> it is apparent that there are some members whose daily conduct is a denial of the faith which they profess; and it is interesting to find that Paul, in enforcing the lesson of bodily discipline and purity, does so by reference to the Christian hope that Christ is to come to change our present body and make it like to the body of His glory. There is, of course, an obvious connexion between Paul's thought here and in the great resurrection-chapter of 1 Corinthians, which on our view was written not more than a few months later. We may indeed go further and point out how in all the Epistles of this period (*i.e.* the Imprisonment Epistles and the Corinthian Epistles) there is a new emphasis on that resurrection which the believer is to share with Christ. The prospect of possible death, as we said earlier, has by this time come to loom large in Paul's outlook, and death for Christ's sake is an experience in which the Christian will rejoice and expect others to rejoice with him (2<sup>17, 18</sup>); in fact, he will desire to have his whole nature so transformed that even

<sup>1</sup> So Lohmeyer in his *Commentary* (Meyer) and in his more recent brochure *Kyrios Jesus*; cf. Lowther Clarke, *New Testament Problems*, p. 143 ff.



in life he may participate in the death of Christ (3<sup>10</sup>). But while glorying in the privilege of sharing in the sufferings of Christ, he is sustained, too, by the hope that in Christ he will yet attain to the resurrection of the dead (3<sup>11</sup>), and day by day wherever he goes he bears about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in his body (2 Co 4<sup>10</sup>).

This rapid survey may help to show what case there is for assigning Philipians to Ephesus rather

than to Rome. It is a principle of Biblical criticism that a primary condition of understanding our documents is that we should read them as far as may be in their original context. The principle may sometimes be applied too pedantically, but in essence it is sound. What, then, are we to say if, in interpreting the message of a book, scholarship should begin by placing it in a setting with which originally it had nothing to do? Yet this is the fate which, following tradition, scholarship has too long meted out to St. Paul's Epistle to the Philipians.

## National Contributions to Biblical Science.

### XIV. The Contribution of France to Church History.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN VIÉNOT, PARIS.

As the space available to me for treating such a vast subject is necessarily restricted, I must limit myself to indicating the main facts and directing the reader to the great names and works which have marked the stages of progress in historical study in France, in the field of Church history. This history dates only from the Renaissance and the Reformation. Before this time there were documents and chronicles, but there was no account, more or less rational, of the life and thought of the Christian Church. But what was the Renaissance? F. Buisson, in his beautiful book on S. Castellion, has defined it properly: 'It is not only literature that blossoms afresh, it is human thought; it is not from the imagination alone, but from the bottom of the soul, that this wave of youthfulness and hope gushes forth which is going to renew everything; it is the entire man that shakes off the dust of the Middle Ages. Christian literature has its renaissance at the same time. And with the same heart that we return to classical antiquity, we go back to primitive Christianity. Just as Homer and Virgil, Cicero and Demosthenes, shine anew in their beauty, freed from all the wrappings of scholasticism, so the Christ of the Gospels reappears, as His first disciples had shown Him to the world, in the simplicity of his Divine figure.'<sup>1</sup> The Renaissance and the Reformation at their inception were together a spontaneous outburst of intellectual and

religious freedom, and ecclesiastical history is the daughter of this movement, which affected all Europe.

It was in Italy that the Renaissance blossomed first, and from that quarter came the first works on the history of the Church.<sup>2</sup> What was wanting before this was the power of reaction, that inner 'energy' of the individual who knows his own worth and dares to affirm it while freeing himself from surrounding influences. This 'energy' was no longer wanting when Dante laid down the principle that the welfare of man consists in putting his individual force into operation, nor when Petrarch went so far as to call Rome a 'Babylonian Empire' and the Church a 'shameless daughter,' and when he attacked the disastrous 'Donation of Constantine' which had 'turned the bride of Christ from her chastity, humility, and poverty into a lewd adulteress.' It was only afterwards that Laurent Valla proved the famous 'Donation' to be forged, but he contested at the same time the temporal power of the Pope who, he declared, was only *Vicarius Christi et non etiam Caesaris* (cf. the works of Döllinger).

It was in this way, by the criticism of existing institutions, that ecclesiastical history really commenced. Italian humanism enjoyed, under the very eyes of the Church, a liberty which astonished those who knew the next period. It had perfect

<sup>1</sup> *Sébastien Castellion*, i. 51.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ed. Fueter, *Histoire de l'historiographie moderne*, tr. E. Jeanmaire, Paris, 1914, pp. 758.

freedom of culture, though this ended in a profound scepticism which was shared by certain popes. The reason was that these rulers of the Church knew well that the humanists and critics were not dangerous. At the beginning of the sixteenth century they were guided by the principle, '*Intus ut libet, foris ut moris est*,' and were conformists in a sense. Some of the critics, however, brought danger. Such was Erasmus who, in his *Dialogues* and his *Praise of Folly*, criticised the Church, the clergy, the monks, and the dogmas so strongly that one might reasonably regard him as one who led the way to the Reformation. Hence it was that this liberty of action soon disappeared. The works of Guichardin could no longer appear except in a mutilated form. The period of repression commenced, when to speak freely of the Church and similar matters was to be suspected of heretical tendencies, and this led reformers very far, even to the stake.

In these circumstances, it was inevitable that the history of the Church should be at the beginning a Protestant affair. The Christian Church is an outcome of the spirit of Jesus Christ working in human souls and transforming them. The development of the Church in the course of the ages has brought with it diversity of interpretation, of thought, of worship, and of organization. It has also been subject to the human law of deterioration. The history of the Church is the picture of this development, with all these changes. It must rest on an impartial, loyal, and rigorous criticism of the evidence on which it is based. One may say that where there is no liberty there is no history. But the element of liberty has never quite failed the Reformation, in spite of the inconsistencies which are always possible even to creative genius. Luther had no desire to be a political emancipator, but 'if it be a question,' he said, 'of mind and conscience, we are of all men the freest from every bondage. There we believe no one, there we acknowledge no one, there we dread no one beyond Christ alone.' And Luther made history. Yet real ecclesiastical history does not commence in Germany till the famous 'Magdeburg Centuries' which provoked the celebrated reply of Baronius in his *Ecclesiastical Annals*.

Ecclesiastical history is the common domain of all Christians, and indeed every people has brought and still brings to it its peculiar contribution. The historian commences by criticism of the sources, that is to say, of the records which establish the facts. It is necessary to know the statements of eye-witnesses and other contemporary persons, the

writings of historians who have drawn from sources now lost, and public and private documents bearing on the matter, to say nothing of popular legends. The historian must also bring the auxiliary sciences to his service, such as chronology, philology, diplomatics, geography, and statistics. He must not neglect general history, nor that of law, art, literature, and other branches, so far as these may be included in the life and history of the Church. All this vast work, of which humanism caught a glimpse at the end of the fifteenth century, and which was rendered too dangerous at the beginning of the sixteenth by the prisons and fires of persecutors, could only be undertaken in the second half of the latter century.

This century was a time of prodigious intellectual activity, which necessarily reacted on history, inasmuch as it provided weapons for men engaged in the formidable combats of the time and documents in favour of their ideas. But this historical activity did not actually awaken in France until the second half of the century. It was then that a spirit of liberty and inquiry took possession of men who wished to reform the Church, the institutions, and the laws. It was often the same individuals who wanted everything reformed at the same time. 'Thus we see,' says Gabriel Monod, 'that the men who occupy the first rank, owing to their historical works, were Protestants' or 'politicians,' for the reason that they were Gallicans hostile to ultramontane views. This was the case with the lawyer Ch. Du Moulin, with Holman, who was led by the persecutions against the Protestants to examine the origin of the royal power, with Jacques Bongars, the editor of the historians of the Crusades, with Scaliger, the founder of chronological science, with Jean de Serres, with La Popelinière, with La Nöne, with Du Plessis-Mornay, and with Agrippa d'Aubigné. On the other hand, it was the practical necessity of instruction and defence that compelled the reformed people to gather together carefully the documents and narratives which might serve in the justification of their ideas or in the exaltation of their leaders. In addition to Calvin, there was Crespin and his *Martyrology*, there was Theodore of Beza's *Histoire ecclésiastique*, and Simon Goulart's *Mémoires de l'État de France sous Charles IX.*<sup>1</sup>

But the Protestants were not the only ones who examined documents and made history. There were, for example, the two brothers Pierre and

<sup>1</sup> On all these men, one may usefully consult *La France Protestante*, by the brothers Haag (1st and 2nd editions).



François Pithou, who had once been Protestants, but recanted. One of these wrote a remarkable *Histoire du protestantisme à Troyes*, which has unfortunately not been published. There was Claude Vignier, too, an old Protestant also and a writer who kept his opinions largely on the Protestant side. In his *Bibliothèque historique* he lays down principles of historical criticism which must have been astonishing for his age. We may also mention Jean Bodin, who had a strong mind of singular boldness, Pasquier, Papyre Masson, du Tillet, d'Argentié.

The method adopted by the Protestants in the sixteenth century was that of investigation and experience. This method, indeed, in spite of partial opposition and occasional failures, extended itself to all domains of knowledge. Religious tradition was no longer received except under close examination. In the same way, in the study of Nature or surgery, the old Protestants, Bernard Palissy and Ambroise Paré, substituted their experience for the traditional opinions and the observations of others. Apart from the Bible, which was too sacred to deal with, these men would not submit without discussion to any supposed 'authorities.' They first weighed them and reasoned about them. They were compelled, on the other hand, in face of adversaries as well armed as themselves, to produce their references. The habit of exact citation, in fact, became the rule, and constituted a sign of progress. This progress was already apparent, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, in Viguier's *Histoire de l'Église*, a work much superior to the usual legendary expositions. Pierre de l'Estoile, who had studied it, stated that it had 'confirmed him in the opinion that he had always had of the falsity of the papal primacy, the abuses committed by the Roman Church, and the vanity of its traditions.' 'This book is good,' he said, 'and exceedingly useful for the discovery of the truth.' L'Estoile was one of those Gallican Catholics who did not seek to uphold a side but rather to serve the truth. His *Mémoires-journeaux* should be consulted carefully by the ecclesiastical historian for the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century. He was sincerely pious, a friend of his Church, actively hostile to the Jesuits and to superstition, though he wrote at a time when the Jesuits already exercised a power with which the most influential had to reckon.

The Abbé de Mézeray is another of those Gallicans whose views were not clouded by ecclesiastical passion. For Fueter, Mézeray was the first national

French historian who possessed an independent political judgment. 'He was,' he declared, 'by no means impartial, being an adherent of the political party. He was not a believer except in so far as it was necessary to be an honest man. But he neither altered nor falsified anything, kept always his good sense, and expressed his opinions boldly. Modern conclusions have come, on a great many points, to his sober views.' This is exactly our own experience before we knew this judgment of Fueter. But the relative liberty of such an historian as Mézeray did not last long. The reign of Louis xiv. was approaching. In a short time historians lost the right of giving utterance to independent political judgments. And Mézeray himself was not friendly with Colbert. What was true in politics was not less so in ecclesiastical affairs. The censoring of books, too, was at its height, and we enter on a long period during which they had to serve the religious politics of the king or else be thrown to the flames.

Gabriel Daniel, for instance, the author of a *Histoire de France*, up to the year 1610, was a learned Jesuit, hard-working and conscientious but he was not independent. The art of Jesuit historiographers, in the case of any thorny question, was to shun a decided judgment. They laid little or no stress on witnesses who were unfavourable, and they avoided the narration of repugnant incidents. Nevertheless, the cleverness of Daniel triumphed over his double position as Jesuit and Court historiographer. The French Court was Gallican, the Jesuit Order was ultramontane. It was a real conflict, and one can guess what sacrifices Daniel had to consent to. He was not able, however, to crush Mézeray, which was his first intention. The work of Daniel, according to Fueter, was the last remarkable production of the national historiographer before the era of romanticism began. The works of Velly and Anquetil are quite valueless.

In our view, however, an exception must be made in the case of De Thou.<sup>1</sup> Fueter does not quite do him justice. He admits that he was simple, virile, and honourable. But he reproaches him with carrying to the extreme his Gallican opinions, and his indulgence towards the Protestants. De Thou's book, which took the form of a thesis, sought to prove that it was in the interests of France to suppress schism amicably and not by violence. This thesis was based on the facts themselves, and appealed to all enlightened spirits as well as to De Thou himself in his position as President of

<sup>1</sup> *Historia sui temporis* (1546-1607).

Parliament. If it had triumphed, it would have saved France from all the misfortunes born of that violent epoch of reaction and political and religious absolutism which extended from 1610 to the end of the eighteenth century. Fueter did not recognize that De Thou was concerned with reality, that he always kept his judgment calm as a man of State, that he was fully acquainted with the situation, at least in France, and that he possessed a very clear view of the possibilities of the moment. All this was the basis of the lasting glory that came to this esteemed and courageous President of the Paris Parliament.

The seventeenth century has been defined as the 'Theological-Despotic' age. It produced a reaction against the outburst of liberty which had marked the beginnings of the previous one. It was a century of controversies. The Jesuits, who had secured an entrance everywhere, especially in the courts, and who had shaped the lives of men of influence, entered also on the scene in the domain of history. They acted as critics, spread abroad absurd legends, and were silent on points of difficulty. They were well armed for the struggle, and wrote in very good Latin or clear French. But, according to Fueter, all this was a deception of the eye. They copied the forms of humanism, but their spirit was otherwise. They wrote particularly *ad maiorem Dei gloriam*, but never forgot the interests of their Order. This can be seen in the case of the brilliant cardinal Du Perron, Pierre Coton, and P. Maimbourg. History, so far as its practical end was concerned, was of such a nature that Richelieu himself thought it useful in his own interests to enter the lists, producing a writing quite unworthy of him, in which he published the coarse legends which had been spread abroad about Calvin.

But the great Catholic controversial historian of the time, who eclipsed all others by the splendour of his style and the breadth of his views, was undoubtedly Bossuet. His principal work was his famous *Histoire des variations*, an eloquent and clever production for an age smitten with the dream of religious unity. But the theory fell before history itself, for the very activities of the Church consisted in its variations. It was with reason that La Bastide reproached Bossuet with being the proof of this himself, since he had presented in his *Exposition de la doctrine catholique* (1671) such a reduced or attenuated creed that the Church could not recognize it, and in fact does not recognize it to-day. His *Discours sur l'histoire universelle* is much inferior to his *Histoire des variations*. 'It is neither

remarkable nor original,' says Fueter. And he adds: 'We must not imagine that the recent eulogies of the French historians of literature lead us to believe that Bossuet recovered this want of criticism or erudition by his remarkable sketches or considerations on the philosophy of history. Bossuet is not original as a philosophical historian. He has not profited by the enlarged horizon which has been opened through the discoveries made in America and in eastern Asia.' This Discourse of Bossuet's is not an historical work: it is a sermon, with history as a text, and Fueter's judgment, severe though it is, is nevertheless correct. We cannot follow Fueter, however, in his treatment of Rollin, to whom he gives no place in his *Histoire de l'historiographie* on the ground that he Christianized early history. The name of Rollin, on the contrary, should figure there, not because he was a clever teacher and a man of sincere kindness, but because he was the first perhaps to point out the importance of the study of history in education, and especially in national education, and this applies very well to religious history.<sup>1</sup>

The Protestants stood up to their adversaries on the ground of history. The synods—better advised than those of to-day, which lose much time and strength on small matters or secondary interests—kept the question to the front by exhortations and instructions constantly repeated. Bossuet found opponents worthy of him in Paul Ferry and Jean Claude. In the Protestant academies of Saumur, Montauban, Sedan, and Nîmes, competent scholars, such as Chamier, the Scottish Cameron, Amyrault, Cappel, Pierre Du Moulin, Samuel Petit, and others, were already busy with true historical criticism. In Paris, the Protestant minister, Jean Daillé, in a book which Bayle calls a masterpiece (*De usu Patrum*, Geneva, 1636), established the principle that the Church Fathers could not be regarded as judges between Protestants and Catholics, because they differed among themselves, that it was impossible to know their real opinion on controverted matters, and, in short, that they could not take the place of the Bible. But, according to Bayle, one of the men in those days who knew best ecclesiastical and civil history—and let us add, one of the best critics of his age—was Pastor David Blondel. He was the first to clear up the question of the 'False Decretals,' and he had the honour of destroying the legend of the false Pope Joan in his *Familier éclaircissement de la question*

<sup>1</sup> Fueter makes an error of date (*loc. cit.*, p. 35). Rollin was not deprived as a Jansenist of his position as Rector of the University in 1702, but in 1712.



*si une femme a été assise au siège papal de Rome entre Léon IV. et Benoît III.*, Amsterdam, 1647.

But the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes came in 1685 to close the Protestant academies, which were homes of historical criticism, and to expel their learned pastors. It was in Holland that Elie Benoist had to write his five volumes on the *Histoire de l'Édit de Nantes*, an admirable work, conscientious and well documented. It was in Germany that Larrey wrote his *Histoire de Louis XIV.*, a book wonderfully impartial, considering that it came from the pen of a refugee. It was in Berlin that Ancillon and Formey continued their historical productions. But we must not let the rumour of these controversies and the tragic error of the Revocation, which exiled so many talents and so much science, make us forget the great fact that the grand epoch of Catholic ecclesiastical science dates from the age of Louis XIV. and extends up to the eighteenth century. It was then that Adrien Valois gave in his *Notitia Galliarum* and his *Gesta Francorum* some models of historical criticism which could not be lost on the historians of the Church. The brothers Sainte-Marthe suggested the plan of *Gallia Christiana*, and commenced its issue. Baluze was not always scrupulous, but he was a hard worker who edited many texts. Du Cange put an indispensable instrument into the hands of historians in his *Glossarium*. Gabriel Monod pointed with good reason to the zeal which the Catholic clergy of this epoch manifested for study and intellectual works. 'Doubtless,' he said, 'they had neither the boldness nor the liberty which made the scholars of the sixteenth century so interesting and sympathetic, but they had the patience, the method, the traditional spirit which allows great enterprises, the regularity, and the prudence necessary for good work, and, above all, the intelligence of the Middle Ages.'

At that time, indeed, Jesuits, Oratorians, Benedictines, Jansenists, and others rivalled each other in ardour and activity. The Jesuits had P. Sirmond, who published the first collection of the

*Conciles de France*, Philippe Labbe, whose editions of the *Conciles* are well known to all historians, the famous P. Petau, and P. Daniel, whom we have already mentioned. Jean Bolland commenced his immense collection of *Acta Sanctorum*, bringing into this hagiographic literature a liberty of judgment and a wise scepticism which were not always met with to the same degree among the Benedictines, as G. Monod says. Richard Simon, whom Bossuet fought so sternly, gave an example of scientific criticism applied to sacred history and thereby threw some glory on his Oratorian Order. Lecointe, in his *Annales ecclésiastiques*, served criticism by the doubts which he raised on the authenticity of the documents of the Middle Ages. Thomassin published the *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Église*. The Jansenists, who were mainly occupied with education or dogma, had Le Nain de Tillemont, who showed how one can reach historical criticism by comparing the texts. As for the Benedictines, who were real workers, none of them deserved this title better than those belonging to the congregation of Saint-Maur, who were grouped round the Abbey of St. Germain-des-Prés. Such were Ruinart, d'Achery, Mabillon, Montfaucon, Martène, and Félibien. These undertook the famous historical collections, such as *Gallia Christiana*, *L'art de vérifier les dates*, *Les Historiens de France*, *L'histoire littéraire de la France*, and the collection of *Histoires provinciales*.

All such work continued to the eighteenth century, with the help of the Académie des Inscriptions. The ecclesiastical works of Jean Lebeuf are models of criticism. The trouble that happened to Fréret, who was put in the Bastille in 1714 for his *Discours sur l'origine des Français*, which touched the royal susceptibilities, shows that the historians of that period were not entirely free. We should be all the more grateful to them for the measure of independence that they preserved, and which is worth all the attacks of the 'traditionalists' of the succeeding centuries.

(To be continued.)

---

## Literature.

### JOSHUA—JUDGES.

THE problems raised by these books are literary, historical, and geographical. The broad outlines of the literary problem are practically settled;

but only an archæologist who knows Palestine from end to end and who has a wide and intimate knowledge of the political condition of the contemporary world in the three or four centuries preceding 1050 B.C. is competent to comment on these books

with any approach to adequacy. By his long experience of Palestine and his skill in conducting excavations, Dr. John Garstang, who in his 'Hittite Empire' has already rendered magnificent service to the study of ancient history, is ideally fitted for his task. In his *Joshua-Judges* (Constable; 20s. net) he approaches the fact revealed by Old Testament literary criticism and archæological investigation and lets them speak for themselves. It is unfortunate that traditionalists frequently claim that their views of the Bible are supported by archæology. Dr. Garstang's conduct of the argument shows that while this claim is largely justified—especially on the historical side, which is much the more important—it is not justified on the literary side: he frankly recognizes, as the traditionalists do not, the validity of the main results of literary criticism, which distinguishes J and E (or JE) as the earliest and most reliable documents from the later, though these are not without their historical value. Indeed, he prints the JE sections of *Joshua-Judges* continuously, and bases his whole discussion on them in the commentary proper, grouping two or three verses together and discussing them in the light of all the archæological and historical evidence available.

The result is a commentary of quite a unique kind. There is no moralizing whatever; the book is written with an austere historical purpose. Yet the careful ear will detect an undertone of religious interest which just begins to be heard a little more clearly when, on the last page of the book, we are reminded that 'in spite of the dispersal of the tribes, and their prolonged association with peoples worshipping strange gods with attractive rites, the flame of Israel's religion was kept alive. . . . In spite of all, though the years drew out into centuries, somewhere, "between Ramah and Bethel," the spark was kept glowing, ready when the propitious moment returned to burst anew into flame, and so guide the People farther along the unknown path they followed at the bidding of their God.' The historical interest is, however, supreme, and it is pursued with inflexible honesty of purpose, coupled with inexhaustible patience in archæological investigation. Abundant proofs are here of the skill and toil which Dr. Garstang has directed upon the excavation of Jericho. The result of all this has been to create a new respect for the Biblical tradition. The information supplied by the earlier documents, in whose geography and archæology was found no 'radical flaw,' is proved to be so detailed and reliable that Dr. Garstang is convinced that they

must be derived from writings earlier still and almost contemporary with the events described, so that J and E do not represent a merely oral tradition. To say nothing of old collections of poetry, such as the lost 'Book of Jashar,' and the 'Book of the Wars of Jehovah,' on which some of the narratives admittedly rest, Dr. Garstang thinks it probable that 'the religious leaders of Israel, soon after their entry into Canaan, adopted the system of writing well developed in the land, and commenced at any rate a series of sacred archives.'

One of the points on which the volume continually insists is that the Book of *Joshua* and especially *Judges* can only be understood against the background of contemporary Egyptian history. Egyptian chronology supplies the framework within which the various periods of rest recorded in *Judges* become intelligible: they 'correspond severally and without discrepancy to the periods of effective Egyptian rule. In particular the one long period of eighty years' rest covers precisely the exceptionally long reign of Ramses the Great.' Dr. Garstang—it will be seen from this last sentence—does not accept the view which identifies Ramses with the Pharaoh of the oppression. He takes much more seriously than most critics the chronological data of *Judges* and regards the period between Moses and Eli as much longer than they do. He believes that *Joshua* was called to the leadership of Israel in 1407 B.C., and that to the fourteenth century B.C. may be assigned the settlement of the tribes.

The treatment of the more outstanding incidents is illuminated by modern parallels which add to the credibility and realism of the narratives. It is suggested, for example, that the fall of the walls of Jericho, which lies within the earthquake zone, may possibly have been due to an earthquake; 'the havoc caused by the earthquakes of 1927 amounted to a national disaster.' During these same earthquakes the Jordan was dammed by the fall of a section of a cliff, a hundred and fifty feet in height, across the river in a way which illustrates the passage of the Jordan by Israel on foot described in *Jos* 3f. And to illustrate the experience of Sisera's chariots on the wet plain of Esdraelon we are reminded that 'during the Great War a quarter of an hour's rain on this clay soil endangered the issue of all cavalry manœuvres.'

The reading of the elaborate topographical discussions is greatly facilitated by the addition of nineteen maps and seventy-three beautifully executed plates. Dr. Garstang has made a contribu-



tion of very solid worth to our knowledge of Biblical history, geography, and archæology, which is all the more valuable that it is written so dispassionately, and all the more vivid and convincing that it connects Biblical with contemporary history. It is a fine supplement to Burney's noble commentary on Judges, and Sir George Adam Smith's 'Historical Geography,' and will furnish much welcome material to the writer of the next elaborate commentary on Joshua for which we have waited so long.

### INDIVIDUALISM.

Anything that Professor John Dewey writes is entitled to close and respectful study. In his most recent book, *Individualism Old and New* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), he leaves the technicalities of philosophy to give a searching analysis of the influences of the present industrial age upon the individual. Although he writes with his eye on American industrialism, what he says may be taken as generally true of European conditions. The old individualism is dead; life is becoming increasingly corporate. If individuality is not to be swamped and lost, some means must be found of establishing a harmony between the individual mind and a civilization made outwardly corporate. How this harmony is to be achieved we are not very clearly told. 'I am not anxious to depict the form which this emergent individualism will assume. Indeed, I do not see how it can be described until more progress has been made in its production.' As a humanist Professor Dewey has not faith in 'wholesale creeds and all-inclusive ideals.' To speak of evil in moral terms he regards as 'pre-scientific.' But 'individuality is inextinguishable and it is of its nature to assert itself. The first move in recovery of an integrated individual is accordingly with the individual himself. . . . To gain an integrated individuality, each of us needs to cultivate his own garden. But there is no fence about this garden; it is no sharply marked-off enclosure. Our garden is the world, in the angle at which it touches our own manner of being. By accepting the corporate and industrial world in which we live, and by thus fulfilling the precondition for interaction with it, we, who are also parts of the moving present, create ourselves as we create an unknown future.'

### NONCONFORMIST ACADEMIES.

An excellent piece of historical research is to be found in *English Education under the Test Acts:*

*Being the History of the Nonconformist Academies, 1662-1820*, by the Rev. H. M'Lachlan, M.A., D.D., Lecturer in Hellenistic Greek in the University of Manchester (Manchester University Press; 12s. 6d. net). The Act of Uniformity of 1662 disallowed all but Episcopal Orders and imposed on all schoolmasters and tutors the oath of non-resistance. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were preserves of the National Church, and their monopoly reflected unfavourably on the standard of learning and education which they maintained. In these circumstances unofficial 'academies' sprang up in various quarters, in which Nonconformists could find the intellectual satisfaction they craved for, and in which training was given for ministries outside the Established Church. The development of this movement is traced in the volume before us, and the history of the various academies is followed out in detail. Incidentally, a survey is given of the condition of university education at the time, and the influence of Scottish colleges on England carefully noted. The book is the result of wide reading and much intelligent labour, and throws many interesting side-lights on the intellectual life of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

### CHRIST OUR BROTHER.

In *Christ our Brother* (Sheed & Ward; 7s. 6d. net) Dr. Karl Adam has given us an eminently sane and readable book. It is issued with the imprimatur of the Roman Church, but it deals in the main with the things about which all the branches of the Church are agreed. It portrays Jesus 'in His life and work, His preaching and His prayer, as the second Adam, whose office of Mediator is vitally bound up with His humanity.' A wholesome warning is given against the attitude of devotion to the Divine Christ which would obscure the fullness of the Godhead. It is to God the Father we pray through Christ in the Holy Spirit. In criticism of the Protestant doctrine of saving faith, Dr. Adam says: 'My faith is genuine and true only when it grips my whole being, when I do not merely trust in Christ, but, so far as lies in me, put my thought and will, my whole ethico-religious energy, at the service of His redemption.' This is surely a position with which every Protestant will cordially agree, especially when it is added that 'throughout the whole process of our salvation, its beginning, progress, and consummation, the initiative lies exclusively with God and with His grace through Jesus our Lord. Never and in

no part of that process does the initiative lie with man.' Much has been written about the humanity of Jesus, but not often do we meet a book which so firmly links the human Jesus with the Divine Saviour.

### RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE.

In *The Interpretation of Religious Experience* (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net), Dr. Percy Gardner gives us what may be regarded as the most mature and probably the final statement of his views. The form of the book is influenced throughout by the fact that it is in part a reply to criticisms of his previous writings, and assumes a knowledge of these which every reader may not possess. It is a singularly clear and persuasive presentation of Christian belief from the modernist point of view. Dr. Gardner's work throughout has been guided by two presuppositions: 'first, that the active faculties of man are prior to his speculative faculties, and second, that the realm of spirit is the great or the only reality.' He believes, moreover, that modernism needs for its basis 'some form of pragmatist or activist philosophy which will remove religious faith from the forum of intellectual discussion to the far safer and more satisfying region of moral intuition and practical life.' In his treatment of Christian history he stresses the difference between 'the factual, the humanist, and the spiritual' elements, and seeks to find in the last an unassailable ground of faith. He emphasizes the importance of thought transference in throwing light upon the possibilities of prayer and the reality of the spirit world. It is a book very rich in suggestion.

Under the simple title of *China* (1s. net), the Church Missionary Society has issued an instructive little handbook. In a plain and straightforward way it gives just the information we want about the country and its people, its everyday life, its history and religions, concluding with an account of the present position and struggles of the Christian Church. It is all exceedingly informative, and makes most interesting reading throughout.

The general merits of the Christian World Pulpit are known to us all, and the half-yearly volume is always welcome. The one which has just been issued is the 119th (Christian World Ltd.; 7s. 6d. net). We have given one of the sermons in an abridged form in 'The Christian Year' this month.

While we cannot quite say *ex uno disce omnes*—the sermon quoted is Dr. Glover's—we do say that the general level is very high.

*The Transforming Experience*, by Mr. H. G. Tunnickliff, B.A. (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net), is a simple exposition, whose aim is to 'catch the spirit and outlook of men and women in different ages and places who have entered into a transforming experience of God in Jesus Christ.' In successive chapters it deals with the joy, power, and deliverance brought by the new experience, and its transmission and fellowship. The tone is warmly devotional, while stress is laid on the sunny side of Christian experience, and a number of illustrations are given from Christian biography of men and women who rejoiced in God and their Saviour. A most heartsome and helpful little book.

Popular books of apologetic are being produced in considerable numbers, but a welcome will be given to *An Outline of Faith*, by the Rev. Ernest G. Braham, M.A., B.D. (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. in paper, 3s. 6d. in cloth), for two reasons. It is written by one who has extensive acquaintance with religious teaching and teachers, and it is intended for the benefit principally of those whose business is education. Teachers in training colleges are instructed in methods of all kinds, including methods of teaching Scripture. But they are often left without a background for all this in positive faith, and that is as important as any kind of technical skill. What Mr. Braham provides is just this background, and the 'digest' here given of the main contents of the Christian religion is made by one who, by his intelligence and breadth of mind, is competent to do this important service. The book is excellent in every way, clear, comprehensive, and adequate. It will instruct and help not only teachers, but all who are looking for a simple and sufficient account of the grounds of Christian belief. There is one serious defect, which should be remedied in a second edition. A chapter should be added on the authority of Scripture.

An entertaining and instructive book has been made out of the musical side of certain well-known authors in *Music and Literature*, by Mr. James T. Lightwood (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). The writer takes great names like Chaucer, Dante, Shakespeare, Pepys, Cowper, Luther, and Sir Walter Scott (there are others), and examines their writings to find out both references to music in



these, and also reflections on the state of music in their time. Even Dr. Samuel Johnson is brought under review, though he could hardly tell a fiddle from a bagpipe. In any case, the result is a delightful bunch of chapters, in which we learn much we did not imagine about some of our favourite books. Musicians will be specially interested in these investigations, but there is interest for everybody in such a book.

---

*The Fight for the Faith*, by Mr. Frank C. Raynor and Mr. Ernest C. Tanton (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net), is historical in form. It consists of a rapid and somewhat uncritical survey of Christian history from the Apostolic age to the time of the Reformation. The spirituality of the primitive Church and its entire freedom from organization are greatly overstated. The pretensions and iniquities of the popes are set in vivid contrast to the faith of men like St. Francis, Dante, Thomas à Kempis, and the reformers. The book closes with a summary of the teaching of the Thirty-nine Articles on points where it is opposed to Rome, and special emphasis is laid on the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers.

---

One of the bright features of American religious education is the amount of research which is being undertaken, and the new enterprises which the large resources at the disposal of American colleges enable them to pursue. One example of this may be seen in *Improving Religious Education through Supervision*, by Frank M. McKibben, Professor of Religious Education, North-Western University (Methodist Book Concern; \$1.25). This is a textbook in the 'Standard Course in Leadership Training.' As the title implies, it deals with one point of importance, how the standard of religious education can be raised by adequate and experienced help. The writer deals in turn with the curriculum, class instruction, worship, tests, teachers, and leaders, and shows how in every case tact and knowledge and experience can come to the aid of earnest but unskilled or inexperienced teachers. There is a great deal in the book that will prove suggestive and stimulating to teachers and authorities in our own country.

---

*Before Times Eternal*, by the Rev. G. Herbert Capron, B.A. (Stock; 2s. net), is a little book on a great theme. It is nothing less than 'an attempt to explore something of the nature and eternal thought of God as the background against which alone can be seen, in its true proportion and value,

the foreground of His manifestation of Himself in the person and redemptive work of Jesus Christ.' The author writes with notable reverence and sanity, and the substance of his argument is that only 'if the Cross set up on earth be the dénouement of an *age-long plan and purpose*, and therefore, in its essence and content, co-eternal with that purpose,' are we led to 'recognize, however little we may be able to realize it, that we are in the presence of the *ne plus ultra* of Divine self-giving, which not only deserves, but compels our adoration.'

---

*The Treasure Ship Sails East* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), a gay green book, with a galleon in full sail on its cover, has much to tell small British boys and girls of other little folk over the seas. We sail first to Africa, and are taught how to play the African game of 'Warri,' and how to make a miniature African village with the help of clay, raffia, sticks, and sand. When we get to India Tagore tells us what a little Indian boy imagines with his mother: 'I will be the waves and you will be a strange shore. I shall roll on and on and on, and break upon your lap with laughter.' In Japan we go to a Boys' Festival, which is like 'everybody's birthday all at once.' Outside every house where there is a boy floats a paper carp tied to a pole. The carp always swims upstream against the current, so is an emblem of bravery. The streets are decorated with the iris, which is the boys' flower in Japan, because its leaves are like swords and its flowers like flags. China, we find, is the country for riddles. They are more cunningly phrased than ours, and it takes a long time to guess the answer to 'Two brothers stand apart all day, but at night they take hands.'

Lilian Cox, who has written most of the stories and rhymes in the book, is to be congratulated on the fresh and charming way in which she presents her 'lessons.' Phyllis Hocken, who is responsible for the editing of the book, has been wise in starting the children's journey with the well-beloved 'Ships of Yule.'

---

*The Dawn Wind*, by Miss Olive Wyon (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net), is 'a picture of changing conditions among women in Africa and the East.' Covering so vast a field, the sketches are necessarily brief and impressionist, but they are full of life and colour. The writer does not theorize, but is content to give a record of facts, which, after all, is what is wanted. The general impression left on the mind of the reader is of the violent clash of opposing forces, of the ferment of new ideals and enthusiasms

often ill directed, of bitter disillusionments and reactions, and, in short, of womankind on the march towards a goal that none can foresee.

*Universities in Great Britain, their Position and their Problems*, by Ernest Barker, Litt.D., D.Lit., LL.D., Professor of Political Science in the University of Cambridge (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), is a little book whose title correctly indicates its contents. All that need be known about universities is given here—their courses, their post-graduate work, their finances and equipment, their teachers, and much else. A chapter is given to the 'Defects and Dangers of British Universities,' and a full account is appended of the aims and history of the Student Christian Movement. Dr. Barker earnestly contends for the idea of a university as a source of spiritual culture, and sees grave danger in the tendency to include in the scope of university education technical subjects. The book is valuable and suggestive, both for its spirit and for the reliable information it contains.

*The Task of Happiness*, by the Rev. C. A. Alington, D.D. (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), makes very pleasant reading. It abounds in a wealth of genial reasoning which wins by its sweet persuasiveness. The subject is really the happy home and how to maintain it. The various relations and duties of husband and wife, parents and children, are dealt with in a singularly wise and helpful way. The general thesis which is upheld throughout is that the good life is the happy life, and that religion is the necessary foundation both of goodness and of happiness.

*A Faith to Live By*, by Mr. John Lewis, B.Sc. (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net), is an attempt to present Christianity as 'a faith which can be

welcomed by the most alive and up-to-date of modern men.' It is, however, much more critical than constructive. It belongs to the somewhat large category of books which, having vigorously set forth the shortcomings of our fathers and shown the insufficiency of the old paths, end by leaving us rather in the mist. To say that 'God is known only through the sanity and decency of the life-purpose when it is understood' does not carry us very far. At the same time let it be said that much of the criticism is sound and healthy, while there is manifest throughout the book an ardent devotion to the spirit and way of Jesus.

Since the publication of Spengler's great and somewhat pretentious work on 'The Decline of the West,' it has become the fashion to treat a civilization as an organism with a life-history of growth and decay. In *The Problem of Decadence*, by Mr. Gamaliel Milner, M.A. (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net), we have a learned and dispassionate study of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire. The writer carefully examines all the causes, material and moral, which may have contributed to the catastrophe, and seeks to draw from this study some guiding principles which may throw light on the progress of Western civilization and give some indication of its future development. His analysis is very acute and searching, but he is cautious in drawing conclusions and especially in making application to the world of to-day. He suggests, indeed, that the British Empire is in that stage of its development which would correspond to the age of the Antonines in Rome, which would mean that the prospect in front of us is exceedingly dark and 'troubled,' but he does not commit himself to the validity of this parallel. It is a book worthy of serious study by all who see in history something more than a catalogue of events.

## Is the Book of Ezekiel Pseud=Epigraphic?

BY THE REVEREND CANON J. BATTERSBY HARFORD, M.A., B.D., RIPON.

PROFESSOR C. C. TORREY of Yale says it is.<sup>1</sup> For the last twenty years he has sought to prove that the whole story of the Babylonian Exile and Return is pure fiction. But the Book of Ezekiel, taken as it

<sup>1</sup> *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy* (Yale; 1930).

stands, blocks the way to the acceptance of this proposition. He therefore proceeds to show that the author never lived in Babylonia, and that all the prophecies have their scene in Judah and Jerusalem. He has already performed surgical operations on Second Isaiah and on Jeremiah in order to



make them square with his view. All three were originally Palestinian documents, but in the third century B.C. editors doctored them in order to fit them to a new theory of the national history. They did this, because at that time an internecine struggle was going on between the Samaritans and the Jews. The Samaritans possessed a rival sanctuary at Shechem. They had their sacred copy of the Law, and they claimed that they had retained the ancient tradition, whereas Jerusalem's Temple had been burnt, its priests dispersed, and the true tradition lost. The Jews found it hard to refute this theory, but at last a bright intellect saw the way. The Exile story was invented. The priests had been deported to Babylonia along with their king. There they had preserved the Law and the true tradition and had returned with them to the land of Judah. This land had lain derelict for seventy years, keeping her Sabbaths (2 Ch 36<sup>21</sup>) as fore-shadowed in Lv 26<sup>34, 35</sup>. The returned exiles restored everything as it had been before. Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah was written on the strength of this theory so successfully that, at least as regards the Persian period, for which it is the sole historical authority, it has been accepted for two thousand years as genuine history. But, says Torrey, the real course of events was quite different. According to Jer 52<sup>18-20</sup> only a small number of high-class Jews were taken to Babylonia with their king. The remainder fled to Edom, Moab, Ammon, and neighbouring lands, and returned again as soon as the coast was clear (Jer 40<sup>11, 12</sup>; cf. Ezk 6<sup>8, 12</sup><sup>15f.</sup> etc.). The figures in 2 K 24<sup>14-16</sup> and 25<sup>11</sup> are much exaggerated. The land was doubtless soon repopulated. Probably many aliens came in with the returning Jews. The idea of its lying uninhabited for seventy years is quite incredible.

What, then, about the Book of Ezekiel? Torrey answers: A man living in Jerusalem in the third century B.C. desired to set before his contemporaries the lesson to be learnt from the past, as to the danger of neglecting the warnings of God's servants. In 2 K 21<sup>10-18</sup> 24<sup>2-4</sup>, 19-20 he read how in the days of Manasseh 'Jehovah had spoken by his servants the prophets' in sharp rebuke and warning, and how, when these warnings were disregarded, the inevitable punishment fell. He set himself to picture one such prophet and to put into his mouth the prophetic speeches which he must have made. Such imagining was quite legitimate. We find it in Deuteronomy and other books. No interested motive is discernible, and therefore 'the moral and spiritual greatness of the book remains unimpaired' (Driver, *Comm. on Deut.*, p. lxii). This man wrote

about B.C. 230. The Babylonian Exile story was not yet dominant. The return which he predicts is to be 'from all the nations (or peoples) and lands.' But thirty years later an editor made certain changes which transported the prophecies from the time of Manasseh to the early years of the Captivity and from Palestine to Babylonia.

i. The arguments by which Torrey seeks to establish this theory are as follows. i. In the Talmudic treatise 'Baba Bathra' we read that 'the men of the great synagogue wrote Ezekiel, the Twelve, Daniel and Esther.' From this remarkable statement the 'obvious' conclusion is that 'they knew that the Book was not written by the Ezekiel of the Babylonian Captivity.' 'The oldest Jewish tradition recognizes no Babylonian prophet Ezekiel.'

ii. In this book 'everywhere with rare exceptions we see the handiwork of one man.' But the handiwork of an editor is also to be discovered. Chapter 1 vv.<sup>1-4</sup> are written in the first person, but between them come two verses in the third person. The original author could not have thus written. In v.<sup>1</sup> reference is made to 'the thirtieth year,' but no indication is given as to the era referred to. Many conjectures have been made as to the solution of this two-thousand-year 'Riddle,' but only now is the true solution revealed. By analogy 'the thirtieth year' would naturally be the thirtieth year of a king's reign. Now in the later history of Israel one king did reign thirty years and more, namely, Manasseh. The phrases 'which was the fifth year of King Jehoiachin's captivity' and 'by the river Chebar' were added by a later hand. In conformity with this new date the same writer altered the year-datings—thirteen in all—which are scattered through the book, and which end with the 'twenty-fifth year' (40<sup>1</sup>). He also inserted some eighteen other passages, which describe the author as dwelling in the midst of the Exiles, or as being transported by the Spirit to and from Jerusalem.

iii. The prophet in chapter after chapter addresses his words, not to the exiles, but to the inhabitants of Judea and Jerusalem. He is told, not to write, but to 'speak' (3<sup>4-11</sup> 33<sup>2</sup> etc.). His hearers are to be 'the children of Israel' (10 times), 'the house of Israel' (81), 'the people of the land' (9), 'the rebellious house' (13). Chapters 4-7 are addressed to Jerusalem, the mountains of Israel, the land of Israel. 'Ezekiel' performs symbolic acts (4<sup>1-12</sup> 5<sup>1-4</sup>, note 'in the midst of the city,' 12<sup>5-7</sup>), which could only be of value, if done in the actual sight of the people, for whose warning they were performed.

In 12<sup>20</sup> 'and ye shall know' makes it clear that the verbs in v.<sup>19</sup> were also originally in the second person in conformity with the introductory 'say unto the people of the land.' In chapter 11, apart from vv.<sup>1, 24</sup>, any one reading vv.<sup>2-13</sup> would regard all this as happening in Jerusalem. Again, chapter 24<sup>24</sup> seems only intelligible if the signs were done in the sight of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Similar phenomena, in one chapter after another, compel us to believe that the prophet spoke and acted in Judæa and not in Babylonia.

iv. The sins which are condemned are the sins which were rampant under Manasseh and were rooted out under Josiah (2 K 21<sup>2-7, 16</sup> 23). Their recurrence was rendered impossible by the latter's drastic measures. 2 K 23-25 give no slightest hint that they were reintroduced. On the contrary 23<sup>26</sup> and 24<sup>3</sup> affirm that the final overthrow of the kingdom of Judah was due, not to the sins of the generation then living, but to 'the sins of Manasseh and the innocent blood that he shed.' According to the traditional dates of Ezekiel chapter 8, etc., all the worst forms of forbidden worship were in full operation within one year after the death of Josiah. Could this possibly have happened? No. 2 Kings must be relied upon. The passages in Jeremiah (7<sup>31</sup> 19<sup>5</sup> 32<sup>25</sup>) which denounce Moloch worship were either spoken before the Reformation or are not Jeremiah's at all. The passages in Ezekiel were put by the original author into the mouth of a prophet in the days of Manasseh, and were only afterwards brought down to the fifth and later years of Jehoiachin's captivity.

v. Jeremiah never refers to Ezekiel, or Ezekiel to Jeremiah, during the years when they were apparently delivering the same message. Ezekiel even records a word of Jehovah: 'I sought for a man among [the people of Judæa] that should . . . stand in the gap . . . for the land . . . and I found none.' Yet 'Ezekiel' constantly uses the language and ideas of the Book of Jeremiah. Obviously the prophecy is true to its setting in the days of Manasseh. 'Jeremiah had not yet appeared upon the scene.'

Passages now to be considered indicate that, even when the interpolations of the later editor have been removed, that which remains is not the genuine work of a prophet of Manasseh's reign, but is of much later date.

vi. Persians are spoken of as serving in the armies of Tyre (27<sup>10</sup>) and of Gog (38<sup>5</sup>). But Persians did not appear on the stage of history until the days of Cyrus, and in the O.T. elsewhere Persians are only mentioned in the latest books—Daniel, Esther,

and the Chronicler. There are also two passages which show a knowledge of Alexander the Great. In 26<sup>10</sup> the conqueror of the island-fortress of Tyre is represented as entering into its gates with chariots and wagons, a feat which only became possible when Alexander built a mole from the mainland in B.C. 332. 'Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon' is a later insertion, as its position shows. In chapters 38 and 39 Gog is plainly Alexander. 'The land of Magog' and 'the coastlands' (39<sup>6</sup> RVm) are the Macedonian kingdom and the Grecian coastlands (in Gn 10<sup>2</sup> Magog and Javan are both 'sons of Japheth'). Alexander visited Jerusalem in B.C. 332, and the picture of Gog and his army of many peoples, although it fades off into apocalyptic vision, is plainly based upon the memory of actual invasion.

vii. The Hebrew of Ezekiel is coloured by numerous Aramaic usages, such as 'will be searched for in vain in any Hebrew writings prior to the very latest books, Daniel, Esther, and Ecclesiastes.

viii. The widespread analogies with the language of the Holiness code and of the Priestly legislation, when impartially examined, show that Ezekiel is the borrower, and not *vice versa*. Indeed, the author must have had before him the completed Pentateuch. Not only so, but he shows knowledge and use of Second Isaiah (c. 400 B.C.), the secondary passages of Jeremiah (c. 350 B.C.), and the first half of Daniel (c. 245 B.C.).

The earliest certain evidence of the existence of our book is in Ecclesiasticus, where the son of Sirach (c. 180 B.C.) towards the end of his great eulogy of the famous men of Israel refers successively to Isaiah, Josiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Twelve, Zerubbabel, and Joshua and Nehemiah (48<sup>22-49</sup> 13).

II. So far Professor Torrey. What are we to say to it all? Could this book have been written originally about 230 B.C.? And could it have been so successfully 'edited' thirty years later that for 2000 years no one perceived that anything was wrong? Well, let us see.

i. What is the value of that 'oldest Jewish tradition' to which Torrey appeals? The Talmudic treatise referred to *cannot* be much, if at all, earlier than the sixth century A.D.<sup>1</sup> Its statements are absolutely uncritical. Samuel, e.g., is said to have 'written his own book,' although his death is

<sup>1</sup> For a translation of the whole passage, see Ryle's *Canon of the Old Testament*, Excursus B; see also *Enc. Bibl.* 'Canon of the Old Testament,' §§ 18-21, and now Professor K. Budde's article (in German) in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. L. part ii. 1931. To this last article I am greatly indebted.



recorded in the first half of the book. 'Hezekiah and his company wrote Isaiah, Proverbs, the Song of Songs, and the Preacher.' In Pr 25<sup>1</sup> we read: 'These also are the Proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah copied out.' To the author of the 'Baba Bathra' this mention of a company of scribes was a lucky find, and he promptly ascribed to them not only Pr 25-29, but also 1-24 and, further, other books which by this time were ascribed to Solomon. To these he added Isaiah because he was contemporary with Hezekiah. This throws vivid light upon what the author meant by 'wrote.' The Holy Spirit was the real author of Holy Scripture. He might use Isaiah as His original mouthpiece, but afterwards He could dictate the prophecies to any scribe whom He might choose. In this sense Isaiah was 'written' by the men of Hezekiah, and Ezekiel, etc., were 'written' by the men of the great synagogue. Who were these? The earliest reference to such a Body is in the Pirke Aboth (second or third century A.D.). The Rabbis felt it to be so essential to show that the true tradition had been preserved that they seem to have filled up the huge gap between Ezra and Simon the Just by transforming the great assembly of Neh 8<sup>10</sup> into a great synagogue of eighty-five men. Still later Rabbis seized upon this 'great synagogue' as a company, who could do for Ezekiel and the Twelve what Hezekiah and his company did for Isaiah. To attempt to gather reliable evidence as to the date of Ezekiel from this hopelessly uncritical document is, in Professor Budde's words, to seek to 'gather grapes from thorns.' It considerably shakes our confidence in the soundness of Torrey's critical judgments.

ii. The main plank in Torrey's argument is, however, his interpretation of chapter 1<sup>1-4</sup> (see I. ii. above). But is it possible that such a clever man, as, according to Torrey's showing, the later editor was, could have been content to produce such a chaos? Can we imagine his breaking the narrative of the prophet in the first person (vv.<sup>1, 4</sup>) by introducing a passage in the third person (vv.<sup>2, 3</sup>)? Could he have deliberately left 'in the thirtieth year' hanging in the air without any indication of the era? Would the man who, we are told, so skilfully executed the alteration of place by inserting into v.<sup>1</sup> in the first person 'as I was . . . by the river Chebar,' have thought it necessary to insert in v.<sup>3</sup>, so close to the first, a second statement of place in the third person? But if he did not, who did? The clue to the most probable answer is to be found in the remarkable

fact that the book, as it stands, is unique among the Hebrew prophetic writings in that it has no superscription. Editors have placed at the head of each collection of a prophet's speeches a statement in the third person as to the writer and his time. Four of these superscriptions begin: 'The word of Jehovah which came unto . . . ' Five begin: 'The Word of Jehovah came unto,' and in three of these cases the date (year, month and, once, day) is put in the forefront.<sup>1</sup> Now in Ezk 1<sup>3</sup> we find a similar statement: 'The word of Jehovah came unto Ezekiel.' Have we not here part of a superscription, which originally stood at the head of the book? We note further that in Jeremiah the superscription in the third person is immediately followed by the prophet's own narrative of his call in the first person. Probably the same sequence originally existed also in the cases of Isaiah and Hosea (if, as Budde and others think, Is 6 and Hos 3 once stood at the head of their prophecies immediately after the superscriptions). It is therefore eminently probable that our book in like manner was originally furnished with an editorial superscription, now to be found in v.<sup>3</sup>, and that this was followed by words of the prophet himself in the first person (vv.<sup>1, 4</sup> and hereafter).

But if this be accepted three points still demand elucidation. (a) V.<sup>2</sup> begins: 'In the fifth day of the month, which was the fifth year . . . ' To what does the relative refer back? Grammatically as it stands, it can only refer back to the preceding 'day' or 'month,' but that makes nonsense. It must have originally referred back to a year previously mentioned. What could that year be but 'the thirtieth year' of v.<sup>1</sup>? If so, this note 'which is the fifth year' now stands in the wrong place. And why is 'in the fifth day of the month' now found before it? Must not the words 'in the fifth year . . . ' have been originally a note in the margin, and may not 'in the fifth day of the month,' repeated from v.<sup>1</sup>, have been placed before it to show what this marginal note referred to? (We should in our day put an asterisk and a footnote.) Then, later on, it would seem that the compound marginal note was inserted bodily by an unintelligent copyist into the text in its present place.

(b) When this statement of time was transferred into the text, it would be seen that some statement was required, stating the deed that was done at the said time. We have here a very probable

<sup>1</sup> Note also 'The burden of the word of Jehovah to Israel' (4 times) and 'The Vision (or the words) which . . . saw' (5 times).

reason for the transference of the superscription from its original position to its present position as v.<sup>3</sup>, for in this way the requirement was fully met.

(c) There still remains the crux of the whole passage—‘the thirtieth year’—of what? Torrey says that it originally ran: ‘of King Manasseh,’ and that the later editor omitted the last words. But could he have been content to leave the sentence in its present mutilated shape? If he inserted, as Torrey says, the words: ‘which was in the fifth year . . .’ should we not have expected him to fill in the gap with something which would fit in with that ‘fifth year’? We may therefore acquit the supposed later editor of being responsible for the present mutilation. And, although various ingenious suggestions have been made, no era has been found, of which the thirtieth year really fits with ‘the fifth year.’ What, then, if the thirtieth year does not refer to a public era at all? What if it really states the age of the prophet at the time of his call? This solution, propounded by Origen seventeen hundred years ago, has been ably championed by Professor Budde in our own day.<sup>1</sup> In 1900 he suggested that the gap was originally filled by *‘חַיִּי’* (‘of my life’), on the lines of Gn 7<sup>11</sup>. This year he puts forward a still simpler solution, to read *‘שָׁנָי’* (‘my years’) instead of *‘שָׁנָה’* (‘year’), which gives the sense ‘the thirtieth of my years’ (compare Ps 31<sup>11</sup> ‘my years with sighing,’ 38<sup>10</sup> ‘the residue of my years,’ etc.). The only objections which have been raised to either of these solutions are (a) that in Hebrew usage a man’s age is generally expressed by saying that he was ‘the son of . . . years,’ and (b) that the addition of month and day suggests a regnal year rather than an individual’s life year. These difficulties are not insuperable, and Budde gives answers to them. To sum up, Torrey’s solution of the problem in chapter 1<sup>1-4</sup> will not hold water; Budde’s solution makes but one slight correction of the text, uses the whole material of these verses, places them in an intelligible order (analogous to the introductory verses of other prophetic books), and explains in a reasonable manner all the difficulties which confront us in the traditional text.

iii. Undoubtedly the main body of the prophecies do bear all the marks of delivery in person, whether in fiction or in reality, to the people in their own land. Possibly this is the result of Ezekiel’s high powers of imagination, but Torrey’s is the more natural conclusion. Dr. James Smith in his interest-

ing book published this year<sup>2</sup> arrives at a similar conclusion, but to him they are genuine prophecies uttered mainly in Northern Israel.

iv. Smith and Torrey agree also that the sins which are denounced are the sins which were rampant in the days of Manasseh. Their arguments are weighty, but, whereas Torrey regards the prophecies as the product of the third century B.C., Smith argues for their actual delivery in the time of Manasseh. Torrey argues (I. iv.) that 2 K 21<sup>2-16</sup> supplies all the necessary material for imagination to work upon, but is it conceivable that so massive and impressive a book could have been built up upon so slight a foundation, or that the author would have adopted such a roundabout way of giving his message? And further, whereas 2 K 21-24 lays such particular and repeated stress upon the guilt of King Manasseh, not one single line in Ezekiel points to such a figure. The bloody city, the house of Israel, its princes and rulers, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, all these are denounced unsparingly, but never once is Manasseh even hinted at, or even the word ‘king’ used in this connexion. If the weak but well-meaning Zedekiah was king when these prophecies were delivered, this is intelligible, on Torrey’s supposition it seems inexplicable. Moreover, the picture of idolatrous worship in secret chambers of imagery does not suggest the barefaced pollution of the Temple by Manasseh, nor again do we see the figure of the guilty king, but groups of men and women, and seventy elders, of whom two are mentioned by name.

Space forbids more than the briefest references to Professor Torrey’s remaining arguments.

v. It is true that Jeremiah the prophet seems to be ignored by Ezekiel, but what Hebrew prophet is there who does mention by name a contemporary or nearly contemporary prophet? Isaiah does not mention Micah, nor Hosea Amos.

vi. As for the mention of Persians and the supposed knowledge of Alexander the Great, Torrey, whose ‘Editor’ inserted so many references to Babylonia, cannot complain if we point out with Hölcher that the reference in chapter 27 to Persians in the army of Tyre occurs in that prose section, which is clearly a later insertion, and that the similar reference in chapter 38 may equally be the work of a late hand. As to Gog himself, we have only to read Gressmann and Herrmann to see that this apocalyptic figure is probably modelled upon a Babylonian mythical hero and to realize

<sup>1</sup> See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (Oct. 1900, Aug. and Oct. 1901), and J.B.L., Vol. L. part ii. 1931.

<sup>2</sup> *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: A New Interpretation* (S.P.C.K.; 1931).



the precariousness of an identification with any actual king of history.

vii. The argument from the undoubted Aramaic colouring of the book is also precarious. On the one hand we have books of the second century B.C., which are written in much purer Hebrew, and on the other hand it is quite credible that long residence in Babylonia (or, as Dr. Smith would say, in Northern Israel and beyond) gave the Aramaic colouring which we cannot but observe. It is noteworthy that, while Torrey claims that these Aramaisms pervade the whole book, this is not the

case. They congregate closely in certain chapters (such as the thirteenth), and these are just the passages which Hölischer assigns to his secondary hand.

viii. The question whether Ezekiel used Leviticus and Second Isaiah, etc., or *vice versa*, is one of those literary questions on which it is extremely difficult to arrive at a certain conclusion, so long as they are treated apart from other considerations.

Our final judgment on Professor Torrey's able and ingenious work must, I think, be that, while on certain points he has shed new light, his main thesis fails to carry conviction.

---

## St. Jerome's Letters on the Monastic Life.

BY THE REVEREND W. W. D. GARDINER, B.D., D.LITT., EDINBURGH.

It fell to Jerome at a critical period, when certain ideas had emerged to prominence and when thought generally was rapidly approaching stagnation, to give classic expression to the principles of Monasticism. To the praise of this way of life he brought not merely his great intellectual powers and his profound Scriptural learning, but an unparalleled enthusiasm sustained through the experience of a lifetime. His letters exhibited also the fruits of asceticism in the remarkable group of patrician ladies who were his disciples and correspondents. They had therefore a great vogue, especially among Romans of high rank, and became to a singular degree authoritative in the thought of the West.

They have also other interesting features. No satirist has given a more intimate picture of Roman society or of its lords and ladies, especially ladies, their attendant clerical dandies, their extravagant dress, their lip-salves, and their intrigues. The colour of the picture is intensified also by the tragic setting. The Goth was a menace to the Empire throughout Jerome's life. His birthplace was destroyed while he lived in the desert, and to his retreat at Bethlehem was brought the news of Alaric's sack of Rome. That sad world, in which things once deemed unshakable were visibly shaken and tottering to their doom, was one which made many ready to abandon wealth in an unstable world and seek the peace of an ascetic's cell. Delicately-bred maidens had seen terrible things, and, moreover, the barbarians often treated the holy virgins with reverence and

awe. Monasticism gained therefore a double appeal from the tragic happenings of the day, and Jerome's letters gain a double interest from the same source. Add to all this an animated and indeed impassioned style, free from the solecisms of later writers, a burning enthusiasm for his subject, and more than an occasional touch of sardonic humour, and we have historic documents which amply repay careful re-reading.

I. HIS CALL.—How did Jerome come to be an impassioned advocate of the ascetic life? He was born at Stridon of Pannonia, modern Lembac, about 350 A.D. He calls himself little more than a boy in 374. His parents were Christians, but he does not seem to have been baptized until as a scholar he reached Rome. We know that he fell upon the slippery path of youth (*Ep.* vii.), and the manner of his shipwreck was the loss of virginity—a loss which left him weighted to the earth, envying the dove which glides with motionless quick wings, for innocence can never be recaptured. He lived at Rome with Bonosus, but it was Jerome who first began to serve God (*Ep.* iii.). Together they travelled to Gaul. About this time Jerome made the acquaintance of Rufinus, for long a close friend, later a bitter enemy; and he began his serious studies of the Scriptures. There settled at length at Aquileia a group of young men, Jerome, Bonosus, Rufinus, Hylas, Heliodorus, Evagrius, all ardent students, and the last was full of accounts of the holy places of the East. The cheerful pursuit together of kindred studies lasted for a time, then the little band broke up and was scattered, all

searching (to borrow a phrase from Scottish monastic piety) for a 'desert'—a place in which to pursue the life of devotion in its perfection.

Two incidents seem to be connected with this. One is some action, bitterly resented by Jerome, taken by the Bishop of his native city, Lupicinus (*Ep.* viii.). The other is the fall from virtue of his sister, which may have increased a longing, already excited by Evagrius, for the holy East, and the stability of a solitary life. In the latter's company he travelled towards Jerusalem. On the journey he became acquainted with Syrian devotees, to whom he addressed a longing letter from Antioch. 'Oh! that I could behold the desert,' he wrote, 'dearer to me than any city! Oh! that I could see those lovely spots made into a paradise by the saints that throng them! . . . For my part I am like the sick sheep astray from the flock.'

At this point he began to wish to abandon his vices, but lacked the moral strength necessary to do so. He was in a distracted state, and he had other crosses to bear. Ill-health afflicted him. Two of his companions were carried off by sickness. There came to him then a vision in the night.

'Miserable man that I was,' so he tells the story, 'I would fain only that I might read—Cicero. After nights of prayer, after floods of tears, after recollection of all my past sins, I would once more take up—Plautus! While the old serpent was thus making a plaything of me . . . I was caught up in the spirit and dragged before the judgment seat. . . . Asked who and what I was, I replied, "I am a Christian." He who presided said, "Thou liest. Thou art a Ciceronian, for where thy treasure is there will thy heart be also."' In his dream it seemed to him he was then scourged, and as he cried aloud for mercy those around him joined their entreaties with his. At last the presiding judge had pity. Space was accorded to him on account of his youth to make atonement for his errors. He then gave a solemn promise that he would never again possess or read worldly books.

2. THE CHALCIS SECLUSION.—In point of fact Jerome does not seem to have kept this oath, the excuse being that it was given in a dream, not in reality. Nevertheless he lived ever afterwards as a strict monastic. His first experiment in this direction had for its locality the desert of Chalcis. He described later for Eustochium his life at this time (*Ep.* xxii.). He made vivid the vast empty spaces, the burning sun, his own groanings, tears, and fastings. Nevertheless peace was not his. Bexies of dream-girls haunted him. Desires bubbled up within him. In vain, like a hunted

creature, he flung himself before his Lord seeking mercy. In vain he tortured and wasted his body with abstinence. At times his cell became a place so odious to him that he would flee to lonely heights, to crags and cliffs, to make his devotions. At other times it seemed to be filled with angelic hosts praising God, when he too would sing aloud for joy.

One conjectures from other references (*Ep.* cxxv.) that he learned at this time that one cannot drive out a passion by concentrating on the negation of it. One needed to avoid all the thoughts and sights which might cause tempting ideas and dreams to come to one. He concluded, therefore, that the best way to effect this was to fill the hours with edifying labour. His advice to younger brethren was to have always some work to do. Let them weave baskets, hoe a garden-plot, keep bees, fish, or graft buds on applestocks. He for his part devoted himself to the study of Hebrew, boldly taking a Jew for his tutor. 'From this seed of learning sown in bitterness I now cull sweet fruits,' he was able afterwards to write; but at first the study was adopted as a method of hammering out one passion by another. So absorbed did he become in his new pursuits that he had no time for evil thoughts.

This was a fruitful period of his life as regards production. Among ascetic writings falls to be considered his *Life of Paulus*, the first hermit—an effort after a kind of Church History which he had much at the back of his mind through all his life—a set of biographies of monastics. He made several contributions, and they became the religious novels of the age succeeding his. Their historical value is marred by their excessive credulity and by their detachment from current events. They began the enormous output of hagiologies, and set their accepted form. They are free, however, from the amazing dullness which often was a characteristic of later efforts of this sort.

The letter to Heliodorus (*Ep.* xiv.) is the most important ascetic letter of the period. It chides one who had deserted the monastic life, and invites him to return to his soldierly duty in front of the ramparts. It exhorts him to have no regard for a nephew, should he cling to his neck; or for an aged mother, should she even, with ashes in her hair, plead with her son whom once she nursed at her now withered breasts. The writer says that he is not destitute of human sympathy, 'not born of a flint or suckled of a tigress.' Nevertheless he has evidently discovered that family affection is one of the chief foes of the monastic ideal, and



has set himself to a rather unworthy war with it. The combat is conducted on lines such as one might expect, and liberal use is made of such quotations as, 'He who loves father or mother more than me.' 'Let the dead bury their dead,' etc. This letter also expounds the now accepted doctrine of the Roman Church that the monastic life is the more perfect way of virtue. The reader might say, 'But all my fellow-citizens are Christians! Why should I differ from them!' Let him consider that he has been called to perfection. 'If thou wouldst be perfect, sell all that thou hast.' The perfect servant has nothing beside Christ. Let him be warned too against acceptance of the dangerous office of the priesthood, for a priest must give a strict account of his stewardship. 'If a monk fall, a priest shall intercede for him, but who will intercede for a fallen priest?'

Having cleared the points of controversy, the letter sets its sails to the breeze in a rhapsodical conclusion. 'O desert, bright with the flowers of Christ! O solitude, whence come the stones, of which, in the Apocalypse, the city of the great king is to be built! O wilderness, gladdened with God's especial presence! . . . How long shall gloomy roofs oppress you? How long shall smoky cities immure you? Believe me, I have more light than you. Sweet it is to lay aside the weight of the body, and soar into the pure bright ether' (*Ep.* xiv. Fremantle's translation).

3. THE ROMAN PERIOD.—After five years spent in the desert, Jerome's unfortunate aptitude for controversy forced him to depart from the region of his adoption. After a period in Constantinople he came to Rome. Here he became a kind of dictator in exegetical learning; and, under a friendly Pope, to whom he gave the help of his powerful pen in several controversies, he had liberty to promulgate his monastic views. For our present purpose the importance of his stay at Rome was the friendship formed between him and a group of ladies of high rank who became fascinated with his ascetic ideas. Athanasius had fifty years before introduced this cult as a Christian practice to Rome, where already it was well known as a form of philosophic discipline. Jerome, however, gave it a popular vogue in fashionable circles. He became acquainted with the high-born Paula, the heiress of the Æmilian family. She proved a life-long friend and helper in all that furthered the ascetic mission. Her daughters were Blesilla, who lived in austere widowhood after the death of her husband, Eustochium, the first of the nobility to take the virgin's vow, and Paulina, who married

Jerome's ascetic friend Pammachius. There were also, as members of the same circle, Marcella, whose house on the Aventine was their accustomed meeting-place, her friend Principia, and her sister Asella. There was also the lady Lea, already the head of a convent; and Fabiola, who married twice, but yet seemed to have an unabated zest for fasts and vigils. It was to these chiefly that his letters on the monastic life were written. To them, too, he addressed his introductions to his great commentaries on Scripture. Their friendship was the background of his life at Rome, and afterwards at Bethlehem. These ladies, drawing aside from the corrupt social life of the city, spent their time in the study of the Scriptures and in pious practices of benevolence and devotion.

Ambrose and Prudentius both show us how the Church lived apart from the civic interests of the day. Monasticism, however, took as pessimistic a view of secular Christianity as the latter did of the world. According to Jerome, a type of presbyter common in Rome was one who thought of nothing but dress, who, with curled hair and sparkling rings, walked forth daintily to pay his calls. He tiptoed in his creaseless shoes over the muddy roads, and carried his gossip from house to house. His calls were chiefly made for ladies. He would address them in flattering and, indeed, affectionate terms, praise anything which he saw in their houses which he wished to receive as a present, or even hold out his hand impudently for a fee.

Roman women, as Jerome described them, were pampered and selfish. Their religion was chiefly shown in the ornamentation of their copies of the Scriptures. They themselves affected a 'broad' way of life, had as their motto, 'To the pure all things are pure,' and called the Monastics 'Manichæans.' There was no chance in such company for a young girl to retain her innocence. She would learn very quickly the arts of her sisters, let her shawl droop as if accidentally from white shoulders, veil the face and figure in such a way as to show both to best advantage, and even wear creaking shoes so that wherever she entered all heads might be turned. In society bearded dandies would hold her hand, singers of sensuous songs would turn their eyes towards her, and married ladies would in their intimate conversation suggest all manner of evil. If the maid herself married, her life would be even further divorced from anything which could properly be called religious. Indeed, prattling infants, a noisy household, children waiting for her kiss, the hum of a multitude of weavers and cooks, the reckoning of expenses, the seeing to everything,

the setting of sofas and of flowers, a million cares would make utterly impossible a life of devotion. Further, her husband's evil life, his mistresses, his parasites, his impure talk, would inevitably coarsen her or tempt her to lies and pretence.

Accordingly Jerome strongly advocated for Roman women the life of seclusion. His letter to Eustochium (*Ep.* xxii.) was written at Rome and is a sufficient expression of his opinion. He set forth his views upon the same subject thirty years later; and, though the second production is altogether more moderate and less aggressive in tone, we can see that his convictions upon this subject never changed. The best thing of all for a maiden was to become 'the bride of Christ.' That was the most honourable estate. Marriage was also honourable, but not to so high a degree. Marriage was chiefly to be praised because it gave virgins to the Church. Virginity was not commanded. There lay its peculiar worth. It was an offering freely given to the Lord. God condemned not the married estate, but the virgin made a voluntary offering which He blessed and accepted. This was the highest degree of virtue. Next to that came the state of those who, after being widowed, lived in a holy secondary virginity. The third degree of this practice was like that of Pammachius and Paulina, who had resolved, when they were given an heir, to live ever after the life of fellow-monastics, not of husband and wife. The glory of this practice in its various degrees was the freedom it gave from the control of the things of sense, and it would receive a special kind of reward in heaven. When the virgin of Christ went to the other world, Miriam would chant before her, Thecla would fly to meet her, and she would hear the voice of her Spouse saying to her, 'Rise up, my love, my fair one, and come away.' She would learn to sing that song of Paradise which only the virgins sing.

Many Roman ladies were attracted to the life which Jerome so set forth with eloquent pen and cogent Scripture quotation. It was feared, indeed, that the monk from the desert would draw away all the patrician ladies into what was regarded popularly as a disgusting form of mania. The revulsion was increased by the extravagance of some of the devotees. Paula's daughter, Blesilla, shocked fashionable ideas by appearing in wretched dress, unwashed and unkempt. Her excessive austerities, indeed, wore down her health, and after a few months of this practice she died. Then murmurs were heard. At her funeral, when her grief-stricken mother broke down and had to be

carried from the procession, many attributed her grief to remorse. It was freely said, 'How long shall we tolerate these mad monks? Let us stone them or hurl them into the Tiber. They have misled this unhappy lady.' Then Jerome sought to comfort the tears of Paula and assure her that Blesilla would be remembered for ever. 'In my writings,' he wrote, 'she will never die. She will hear me discoursing of her always with her mother or her sister.' But popular opinion was not so to be satisfied. Moreover, a Pope had come to reign who was unfriendly. Vile slanders were rife, new controversies had arisen, stay at Rome was no longer possible!

4. BETHLEHEM.—Jerome and his little band of devotees felt that they were singing the Lord's song in a strange land. Accordingly they set sail for Palestine, and after a tour of the holy sites settled in Bethlehem, where Jerome became head of a monastic establishment for men, while Paula, with Eustochium, was in charge of a similar institution for women. Now there were, it appears, few austerities and no neglect of personal cleanliness or appearance. Secluded from the world, living on plain fare, praying often in the fields where the shepherds kept their watch on the historic night, the ascetics seemed to have come to their desired haven (*Ep.* xlv.). Jerome, then, in the name of Paula and Eustochium wrote to Marcella, exhorting her to join the pilgrims, who could pray in the cave where the Lord was born, weep at His tomb, stand on the Mount of Olives, pass to the fields of David, or hear just such a herd as Amos blow his horn upon the hills. Rome, he was now convinced, was Babylon; and he exhorted Marcella to come out of it. True, it held a holy Church, but the display, the crowding, the pomp and the display of wealth in it made it unfit for a life of devotion. How different was it at Bethlehem! In the cottage of Christ all was simple and rustic. Nothing was heard but the chanting of Psalms, the Hallelujah of the labourer at his toil, or from the distant hill, the voice of the herdsman upraised in the native songs of the country, the old tunes known to David and the prophets.

After seven years' residence in the Holy Land, Jerome remained still enthusiastic for his place of refuge from the storms of life. At the end of nine years, however (*Ep.* lviii.), he was fain to confess that what he sought was not so much a place as an idea. 'I am no better for staying here,' he wrote. Jerusalem was full of play actors and buffoons, and altogether too much of a Court and Garrison town to be a suitable locality for



Monastics. He was soon to find out also that there was no safety here from the threat of the Empire's foes. Once the Huns were reported to be on the point of invading Palestine (*Ep.* lxxvii.). The monasteries were broken up, and the nuns were hurried to the seaboard. The barbarians turned westward, however, and most of the ascetics returned to their settlements. Others sought safety in Rome—a most insecure quarter, as the event was to show.

Bitter controversy developed also with the local clergy. Jerome himself was attacked in writing by men who had been long his friends. He replied in his caustic manner, and enmity was increased. His opponents, it might be said, had often distinctly the better side in the debate, but they could not make good against the master-exegete. They succeeded only, therefore, in covering themselves and their cause with confusion. Vigilantius, with regard to the question of the worship of relics, and Jovinian in that of the equal holiness of the married estate, by arousing the Bethlehem recluse only did a disservice to the truth. Jerome's position set forth in weighty treatises became, in fact, the accepted position for a thousand years. He firmly established in the popular and official Church conscience that the monastic ideal was the holier life, and that the Scriptures so taught. 'Be fruitful and multiply' was held to be a command which belonged to the old Dispensation. No good could be expected to come to the world in that way now that Messias had come. Some of the Apostles had wives, it was admitted, but they left them. 'We have left all,' said St. Peter. St. John was a virgin, and therefore he was the beloved disciple. If a heretic should condemn marriage, the true Catholic would extol and defend it, but not as an offering of the life to God equal to that of the Monastic. Above marriage must ever be placed Christian chastity and angelic virginity (*Against Jovinianus*).

There are two letters of considerable interest in which Jerome sets forth his ideas as to the training of a girl destined for the holy life. When they were written, Rome had fallen under Alaric (410 A.D.). Marcella had died of ill-treatment at the conqueror's hands. It was a ruined world in which nothing was regarded as secure. Let a young girl therefore, he concluded, know nothing of the past, shun the present, and long only for the future. Her education in his view should direct her to love only holy things, to avoid the world, to make friends only with those under the same vows as herself, to spoil her good looks which might only prove a

snare to her. She should wear coarse clothing, eat ascetic's fare without, indeed, excessive fasting, but never acquire any taste which would need afterwards to be eradicated.

So the course of Western Asceticism went upon its way, shaping the destiny of children of the time, and of how many yet to be born through succeeding centuries. Those, however, who were the first to put these burdens upon the shoulders of European maidenhood were themselves laying their crosses down. It was Jerome's task, then, to write the eulogies of his friends, one by one, as they passed to that reward which had been before them through all their earthly witnessing. Paula died (*Ep.* cvii.) and was laid to rest in the Cave Chapel at Bethlehem. Jerome addressed to her daughter, Eustochium, a letter of comfort which in its very formlessness speaks of the sincerity of his grief. When Eustochium died, however, no eulogy was written, and within a year the eulogist himself was laid to rest beside the mother and daughter in the Cave Chapel, near which he had lived for some thirty-four years. Despite legends to the contrary, his remains were probably never disturbed. So his ashes rest in his 'Paradise of Study,' while his letters live on in the cloisters of Europe—the study and solace of those who have been taught to imitate his first disciples and to see in them the great exemplars of their profession. They are probably dearer to them than even the Latin Vulgate, that other famous product of Jerome's prolific pen.

It is evident that Western Monasticism owes much to Jerome. For all that Monasticism has done we must therefore pay him tribute. St. Ninian was the first to introduce to Scotland an institution for the practice of the ascetic life, and it appears to have been an influential instrument for the evangelization of the land. He was influenced by St. Martin more than by any other, but it is interesting to note that the time of his traditional visit to Rome more or less coincides with the period during which Jerome was teaching on the Aventine. These islands may owe, therefore, a particular debt to the author of the letters which have been our study. At the same time it must be said that the chief defect of Monasticism was just that turn which Jerome gave to it whereby it came to be regarded as a life superior to all others in holiness. Further, such exercises are actually an evil when, as in the case of those who are drawn to them at too early an age, they are not the free choice of men and women who realize what they are doing and understand the sacrifices which they make. We probably

err, however, if we go beyond this and condemn those who feel the ascetic life to be their vocation. As von Hügel's daughter, herself a Carmelite nun, is quoted by him as having once replied to a questioner, 'God's calls within our one great common

vocation are many and various. Souls exist which are as truly called to such mortifications as her (her questioner's) soul was not called to them. Who are we to lay down the law and the limit to God?'

## In the Study.

### Virginibus Puerisque.

'First on the Top.'

BY THE REVEREND J. HOWARD STOOKE, BRISTOL.

'Be forward to honour one another.'—Ro 12<sup>10</sup> (MOFFATT).

Do you like climbing? I do not mean apple trees, but mountains. Perhaps you say, 'I haven't the chance; I wish I had, but there isn't a mountain anywhere near here.' Where I used to live there is what we might call a baby mountain, 1200 feet high, called 'The Pinnacle,' and it was the ambition of every small boy in our school to climb to the top. When he had done so he was big, at least in his own estimation.

On June 21st last four men reached the highest ground that ever human beings have been on—25,447 feet above sea-level. That is something worth making a note of, isn't it? Where is the mountain and what is its name? It is in the Himalayas, and its name is—no, not Everest; that is 29,002 feet high and is still the unconquered giant of the world—its name is Kamet, and four men have tackled it and won.

For many months preparations had been made for the great adventure. Men had to be chosen from the host of volunteers that wanted to go; great care had to be taken over the food to be taken, foot-wear, ice-axes, sleeping-bags, tents, and all the rest. Not least important was the selection of suitable Indian porters to carry all the necessary things to the base-camps. Then came the actual journey from the highest camp to Mount Kamet; the cold was intense, and one man is like to lose a foot that was frost-bitten; steps had to be cut in the ice as they went forward; the men were roped together, and they knew that if they slipped they would crash down a precipice of 7000 feet. And there is one other thing—up as high as that, men find it hard to breathe, so that often they have to take two or three breaths to a step.

It was hard work, and Mount Kamet laughed at the four little figures trying to set foot on his summit. *But they did it.* Who? There was Mr. Smythe, the leader; Mr. Shipton, Mr. Holdsworth, and Lewa, an Indian porter. They got to what they had thought was the top, only to find that there was still a little way to go. They were breathless and spent, but they made one last effort. Mr. Smythe says:

'Heaving ourselves to our feet we started along the snow ridge. . . . The snow was firm, and, planting our feet well into the crest, we advanced. We gained the ice-finger and gazed over and beyond. Only a gentle dip separated us from the summit. We gasped along . . . a few yards from the top we halted, telling Lewa to go ahead. It was the least compliment we could pay to those splendid men, our porters, to whom we owe so much.'

The three Englishmen had dreamed of nothing else for weeks but to get to the top of Kamet, and any one of them would have been proud to say, 'I was the first on the top,' but they stood aside and let the brown-skinned Lewa have the honour.

Do you not think that was fine? They thought not of themselves and what they would like, but of their Indian servant, and they said, 'He shall be first on the top.'

Paul wrote something about that in his letter to the Christians at Rome; he said, 'Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honour preferring one another.' It is not easy to give way to another when there is something good about it, it is hard to be unselfish then, but we become a little like Jesus when we put our own wishes on one side in favour of others. He pleased not Himself, He was always thinking of others, and once He opened a door to His life when He said that He 'came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.'



**A Noble Memorial: Armistice Sunday.**

BY THE REVEREND R. E. THOMAS, M.A.,  
MIDDLESBROUGH.

'Well done, thou good and faithful servant.'—  
Mt 25<sup>21</sup>.

In perhaps the most beautiful of all Scotland's beautiful ruined abbeys there is a grave which thousands of people now go to see each year. The abbey is Dryburgh Abbey, and the grave is that of Field-Marshal Earl Haig. Sheltered by a corner of the ruined walls, this grave is near that of another famous man, Sir Walter Scott. There is no elaborate monument over it. The body of this great soldier lies in the utmost simplicity beneath the green turf. Even the headstone is the same as that which marks the graves of all the soldiers who fell in the Great War. And the inscription on the stone is also the same:

'He trusted in God, and tried to do the right.'

Now there is something very fine about that. Every one knows, of course, that Earl Haig held the highest of all ranks in the British Army. Every one knows that he was leader of that army during much of the time of the sternest ordeal through which it had ever passed. And yet on his grave is written nothing which tells of this, nothing which claims that he was greater in rank or achievement than the multitudes of other men whose leader he was. It is as if he enters God's presence on an equality with the humblest soldier, and no other plea is made for him than is made by loving friends for any other. 'He trusted in God, and tried to do the right.' It does not even say he succeeded in doing the right, though that might have been a just claim to make. Only this—'he tried to do the right.'

Knowing how humble Earl Haig was, we know it is just such a simple grave and just such a simple memorial that he himself would have desired. It reminds us that the greatest men are always the most modest, the least. They make no claim to be better than others. That is the way of humble endeavour which our Lord Jesus Christ Himself taught us to follow.

But there is something else I want to tell you about this grave of Earl Haig. Though nothing more permanent than this simple headstone marks the spot where his body was laid, yet, of course, some who desire to honour the memory of this great man have sent their tributes, and these stand near by in the form of wreaths. One wreath is from His Majesty the King. Another, which is

especially noticeable, was sent by the Boy Scouts of Kansas City. Those who see this latter wreath must feel glad that the boys of such a far-away place should have desired to honour this British soldier. And those boys found a fine inscription to place upon their wreath. The inscription runs thus:

'In peril confident, to duty devoted, in  
victory considerate.'

Each of these three phrases is worth thinking about. But perhaps the last one is most striking of all—'in victory considerate.'

Now towards whom was this hero of the Great War considerate in the hour of his victory? Was it towards the enemy he had conquered? Partly it was. And the real greatness of any fighter is made perfect when he is considerate in victory for those he has fought against and vanquished. But Earl Haig was considerate not only for those he had fought *against*, but also for those he had fought *with*. He took thought, and very great thought, for the multitudes of men of his own armies who were disabled in the War. He was not content merely to enjoy the triumphs and rewards of victory himself, but he set himself to help those upon whom war left its cruel marks of suffering. He employed the years after victory in the great work of helping disabled soldiers. And now, each Armistice Day, Flanders Poppies are sold in the streets of every town and village to raise money to carry on the great work begun by Earl Haig. A few such poppies may be seen raising their scarlet heads from the green turf which covers his own grave. They, too, are a memorial to him.

So when on Armistice Day we see such flowers, and perhaps wear one ourselves, then let us resolve again so to live that some day it may be said also of us: 'He trusted in God, and tried to do the right.'

**The Christian Year.**

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Instead of the Thorn.

'Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree.'—  
Is 55<sup>13</sup>.

What did Jesus Christ come into the world to do? We say He came to make a new world. That is a very comprehensive answer to the question—too comprehensive to be of much good to us. Let us seek for something a little more compassable. We need not look farther for it than in the words

'Instead of the thorn.' The thorn has always been the symbol of the useless things, the little, sharp, cruel things of the world. It is a parable of life, uncultured, untrained, and unproductive. Jesus Christ came to make war on the thorns and all that they represent. And that being so, we cannot deny that the purpose of the gospel is at least practical, serviceable, and necessary. There are a poetry, a romance, an idealism about the teaching of the New Testament and about the life and character of its great central Figure—the Teacher, the historic Christ—that have led some to count Him the Dreamer of a beautiful dream. When men dream they dream of roses, but when Isaiah looked forward, and told in words greater and truer than he knew, the story of the Christ who was to be, he said, 'He shall deal with thorns.' That is the real problem of human life—or a large part of the problem.

Life is full of sharp and pointed things. There is so much that tears and wounds, so much that makes the way painful for them that tread it. 'Instead of the thorn,' or to translate the symbol into the thing for which it stands—instead of the useless, the vain, the worthless; instead of the fretful, the encumbering, the retarding; instead of pain and blood and anguish—a world without thorns. How can it be true that anything could ever root up the brambles and destroy them?

We find the answer folded in the one word 'Instead.' These things are not going simply to be rooted up, they are going to be crowded out. There is going to be no room for them. The death of the thorn is to be a side-issue in the growth of the fir tree. The brier shall languish because the myrtle tree flourishes. The fir and the myrtle shall strike their roots down deep into the ground, and shall draw all its nutritive forces into their finer, stronger life. They shall reach upward toward the sun, and drink his warmth into their whole being; and the brambles clinging beneath them shall find no food for their hungry roots and no sunshine for their prickly branches.

That is the way God is at work in the world. The thorn and the brier are sin and selfishness; the fir and the myrtle are holiness and sacrifice. No moral effort that has for its final issue only the destruction of sin can hope to be successful. The motive is inadequate, and the undertaking is impracticable. We cannot fight the moral battle armed with negatives—no matter how sound those negatives may be. Jesus did not come to destroy thorns. He came to grow fir trees.

Notice how this principle of displacement, this

ousting of evil by good, runs through the teaching of our Lord. Read the opening words of the Sermon on the Mount. That sermon was the manifesto of the spiritual kingdom which Christ founded among men. There is comparatively little reference in that sermon to the world as Christ found it. He knew it was a proud, cruel, impure, strife-riven world. He might have said, 'Cursed be the proud, the cruel, the impure, and the contentious—and all their ways.' But He did not. That would have been paying too much attention to the thorns. He said, 'Blessed are the meek, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers.'

'Overcome evil with good.' There is no other way. No man ever successfully tackled thorns unless he had a vision of firs and myrtles to inspire him. 'Instead.' There is a fine positive motive there. When a man takes up a tract of land in one of the new countries his first work is to clear it of all its useless growths. But he is not spurred on by some deep-founded animosity against those acres of rank and tangled growths. He has another vision in his eyes as he endures, day after day, the strain of that exacting labour. He can see wide fields of wheat ripening in the sun. He has a vision of orchard and garden and crop. It is the principle of displacement at work. It is the thing that is to be that is nerving him to make war on the thing that is.

Let us apply this principle of displacements to ourselves—our own hearts. It is more easily realizable there than anywhere else. If it is difficult to conceive the idea of a thornless world, substitute the idea of a thornless life. Think of one man with no bitterness in his words, no selfishness in his plans, no meanness in his desires, and no hardness in his heart. Tell ourselves that such men we ought to be, and believe it, and we shall straightway be doing our first and most immediate duty in the matter of ousting the thorns.

'Instead of the thorn'—'instead of the brier.' There is something very uncompromising about that programme. It means something to take the place of these things—a real, radical change. There is the philosophy of regeneration, of the new life, in these words. It is but a parabolic way of saying, 'If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things have passed away.' It is not the old life furnished up a bit. That is not God's way. He is Divinely impatient with the thorns and the briers. He says, I will grow something better. These things shall be starved out, crowded out. In the struggle for existence I will oppose to them stronger, fitter, more living things, and they shall die. There



is only one thing that can drive out sin, and that is holiness. It is no good saying, I will not do wrong—unless you also say, I will do right.

But it would be untrue to the facts of life and its existing convictions if one were to speak as if this principle of displacement were an easy one to accept, or an effortless one to fulfil. The King of this ideal kingdom to be came to His throne with a Crown of Thorns about His brow. It has ever been so, and it must be so. 'Instead of the thorn'—there is a tragedy here, a world of endurance and patience and pain.

Whether it be a public wrong or a personal besetment, we cannot touch it to remove it unless we have a willingness to bear pain, some vision of the good that comes of bearing it, and utter faith in One who for us bore the whole pain of sin, and saw the whole vision of good.<sup>1</sup>

#### TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### The White Stone and the White Robe.

'And white robes were given unto every one of them.'  
—Rev 6<sup>11</sup>.

The Book of Revelation has a message for us here and now. Is our situation to-day not very much the same situation that we have here? As we all know, because we read it in the newspapers, and because we are getting old, Christianity is going downhill! Christians to-day are not what they once were! The great old figures we knew in our youth are gone, and the leaders to-day are a smaller generation. And the love of many has waxed cold, and the Soviet is trying to stamp out religion, and what with one thing and another—no, everything is going wrong, and if we do not do something, or if something does not get done, there will not be any Christianity left. This book was written for people in that position. The twelve apostles were all gone. We do not know anybody by name who was left. Not even Antipas; he was gone, as we see in the book. The great leaders were gone. And the unimportant aftergrowth was all that there was to lead the Church. And the government had made up its mind that the Christian Church was going to leave off. It was going to stamp it out in blood. And the thinkers of the world were bringing their batteries to bear on the Christian Church.

To a people who were looking for trouble—and it came all right—this Book of Revelation was written. 'These are they which came out of great tribulation,' says the Authorized Version, omitting

'the,' which makes a great deal of difference. 'These are they which came out of *the* great tribulation.'

What it must have meant to those who read this book, and had the government hunting them down, and putting them to be torn by leopards, and burned alive and other little things of that sort, just to be able to say to themselves as the faggots were lighted: 'These are they that came out of the great tribulation.'

To-day we are going to have trouble all right. Very well, then, let us go to the Book of Revelation, because we want to see the end of things when we are in trouble, and let us get into the way of crooning over the little old songs there, all of them songs of victory. But it is something else about this Book of Revelation that we are to consider. One of the delights in reading is to watch the curious little ways in which a man shows his mind. The curious things he notices! Let us think of the colours that this author sees, and especially notice how this man is haunted by the idea of white. There are quite a number of things which he describes as 'white.' Now, what was in his mind? Some of the things we shall leave on one side—the white horses, the white cloud. We shall speak about three of the white things, and the first is *the white stone*.

It occurs in the promises in the second chapter. 'To him who wins—conquers—overcomes, will I give . . .' There are seven different promises. And one of the gifts promised is a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knows save him who receives it.

What does it mean? I met a missionary from the Congo once who told me that a man he knew had got sleeping sickness, and he went up to him and spoke to him, addressing him by the familiar name, and the man would not have it. I cannot attempt to pronounce the Congo name, even if I remembered it, but say he addressed him as John. No, he was not John, he said, he had nothing to do with John; his name was Peter, or something of that sort, quite different. Well, he *was* John, you know, but he said he was Peter. Why? Because he had sleeping sickness. Well, he would not have had sleeping sickness unless some enemy had bewitched him, had called forth some horrid little devil that could give sleeping sickness and had said: 'Go and put it on John.' That was how he got ill. So he changed his name, and when the devil who was to give him sleeping sickness goes round looking for John, he thinks this man is Peter. Is not that a curious idea?

<sup>1</sup> P. C. Ainsworth, *A Thornless World*, 1.

How many fairy tales there are where the hidden name is the point of the story? The girl turns round and flashes her finger at the little old man, and says: 'Ninny, ninny, not; your name's Tom Tit Tot,' and he is done. We read that there was a hidden name of Rome which nobody knew but the gods and the priests. The enemies went about cursing Rome, but the gods took no notice, because they did not know there was a town called Rome at all.

Now this curious idea suggests to this man that if we want absolute safety in this world we must have a new name, the name that only God knows and we know. And the white jewel—a queer metaphor—but what does it mean? It means that God is interested in us as individuals and God is going to look after us as if there was not anybody else in the world to look after. Supposing the news reached the King to-morrow morning that one of us had died in this church to-night. Would he know who we were? Can we believe that God thinks of us by our Christian name, that instead of being the indistinguishable Smith or Jones, He knows us by our schoolboy nicknames and calls us by them? The white stone means just that, that God knows us by this new name, and that is a pledge that, whatever the trouble that is coming to us, God knows it and is going to carry us through it. That is a gospel for to-day. It is the crux of the whole thing—God cares for us, and God gives us individual joy.

Then *the white robe*. It comes again and again through the book. Thousands around the throne are in white robes. They have washed their robes and made them white, it is sometimes said. Sometimes it is that the white robe is given. Let us read through this book again and make a note of the things that are given. Everything given. A book of songs, a book of victory, a book of white things, a book of things given. The white robe is given.

Now, I want to say this. They brought me up to be a good boy, just awfully, but they were not as successful as they might have been. I have never felt inclined to thank any minister, teacher, preacher, or anybody who told me my duty, because I have always known more duties than I ever did—lots more—and I do not want to hear any more until I have got some of the old ones worked off. If anybody would talk to me about power, dynamic force, that will carry me through those duties I am going to listen to him, because that is a message. When one looks back on one's life one understands what they meant—Luther and

all of them, and this writer—that if there is anything that is right in our lives it is given. 'Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord'—that is the real gospel. Jesus Christ has a message of victory over sin. The white robe means that, and the white robe is given.

If all the fighting we had to do in this world were against a government, against a foe outside, it would be extremely simple. A great many of us can defy external authority; it is the traitor in the heart that troubles us, the black things that we want to do. The promise of the white robe means that those black things will be washed out of our hearts; and God will give us purity, cleanness, and wholesomeness.

The third white thing is *the Great White Throne*. It is said that before the face of Him that sat thereon, heaven and earth fled away. Is not that a master touch, a touch of poetic quality and insight? Heaven and earth fled away. Yes, but they were brought back. The sea gave up its dead. I always think there of what a friend of mine said to me in my Canadian days, talking about the great storms and the ships lost in the vast lakes when winter comes. He said, 'When the spring returns the boats come back, but Superior never gives up its dead.' Stumbled on the very phrase! But this writer says that Superior—the sea—will give up its dead.

In the midst of the Throne is the Lamb. A curious symbol. Perhaps it comes from the Paschal lamb, but all through the book the Lamb comes into the story. All the psalms of victory have one conception running through them; it is the victory of the Lamb. It is Jesus that is to win the ten thousand times ten thousand. The white robe is associated with the blood of the Lamb. Fanciful people do not like metaphors drawn from blood, but while we are turning from it let us make sure we are not losing something real behind it. What does it mean? The death of Jesus is the great central thing which speaks of our salvation. The white stone with the name on it, and the white robe—purity—are only possible because Jesus died. That is what he means. In the midst of the Throne itself, once more, is the Lamb.

Three great pictures then—the white stone, the white robe, and the White Throne, and all bound up with Jesus Christ.

The most living force in the world to-day is Jesus. All the lights in a building burn because they are in touch with the source of power. Are we in touch with the source of power? How



wonderful, how beautiful that glorious life, with its assurance of God's individual care for us, God's interest in our salvation or redemption, our development and growth. God on the Throne for us!<sup>1</sup>

## TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

### The Faith of Jesus.

'Let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith.'—Heb 12<sup>1, 2</sup>.

A strange word! 'Let us run, *looking*'? But this is really the source of all movement in life. Motive-power always depends upon the direction of the mind and heart. 'The world is forwarded,' says Matthew Arnold, 'by having its attention fixed on the best things.' What keeps people up and urges them forward along any line of advance is the inward aim. When by strength of purpose we keep to some course without flagging, when we renounce this and hold to that, when we take a certain line amid the various openings and opportunities of the world, it means that we have set our minds upon a particular end.

'We *run*.' For faith is not drifting with the tide of current practice and opinion; it is a course directed by our sense of God, and especially by our sense of the will of God for us in Jesus Christ.

'Let us run, looking unto *Jesus*.' Why? Because Jesus ran our race. He, too, had to live by faith, as we are called to do. Our English version describes Him as 'the author and finisher of our faith,' but the word 'our' is in italics, and what the apostle meant was that Jesus is 'the pioneer and perfection of faith.' He gives us a lead in the matter of faith, and we are to look to Him as the great Believer. He is our leader and pioneer in this kind of life which follows the will of God, for He began the life of faith at its very beginning and carried it through to the end.

What is *faith*? Belief in God and in some promise of God which is to be worked out in our experience. Now Jesus began His life on earth in the faith that He was the well-beloved Son of the Father. He had heard God assure Him of this vocation, and He ventured to hold fast to it, in spite of everything. And the same quality of tenacity is to mark our faith, whatever discouragements we have to encounter. Faith is the assurance that God has spoken to us, and that He will make His promise good, if we leave Him free to deal with us. When we believe, we trust that God has a future and a

hope for us. What it will be we do not as yet clearly see, but we believe Him when He assures us that our life is to have a meaning and that He will unfold that meaning. It is a faith which never can be held without an effort to discount appearances to the contrary.

Let us look at three of the practical difficulties which meet this line of life, and which have been already met by Jesus Himself.

1. There is *the difficulty of delay* to begin with. To wait is always one of the trials of faith, and it is most trying because it often meets us at the beginning, when we are young and naturally impatient. Yet, look at Jesus! We often forget those eighteen years in the life of Jesus, and what they must have meant for Him. And yet it was during those dragging years from the age of about twelve to the age of about thirty that our Lord was winning His first fight of faith against the temptations of delay. So those who are on the threshold of life, still waiting for some opportunity of wider service, still passed over, apparently, and not yet called to step forward, must look to Jesus, and not grow impatient with God, or gird at circumstances or imagine that they had better take life back into their own hands. If they are ever to be entrusted afterwards with any responsibility and called upon to give a lead to other people, it will be only as they have first learned how to obey and possess their souls in patience.

2. Then there is *the temptation of disappointment*. When the openings do come, when we start to work out the life that God sets before us, it may bring acute disappointments which test the nerve of faith. Some never get the recognition to which they thought themselves legitimately entitled. Others fail to answer the hopes entertained of them by their friends. The handicap of bad health or of uncongenial surroundings may fall on life, and a first flush of success may be followed by a failure, or by what seems a failure in the eyes of men.

Now Jesus knew something of this temptation also. When He was at last called forward to His mission, the nation failed to answer His appeal. At first, indeed, popularity flowed to Him. It was roses, roses all the way, thousands from every part of the country thronging to Him. Apparently He had the nation in His hands. But soon His searching message proved too much for them. The early popularity waned, until He was left with a mere handful of adherents. Yet He never lost His faith in God. With unwavering confidence He clung to the will of God for the world, believing to see the goodness of God in the land of the living.

<sup>1</sup> T. R. Glover, in *The Christian World Pulpit*, cxix.

And there are men and women for whom also God's work has been thus revived in the midst of the years. We know something of what they have had to suffer in their prospects or in their families. But we never find bitter smoke rising from their lives.

Canst thou, thy pride forgot, like Nature pass  
Into the winter night's extinguished mood?  
Canst thou shine now, then darkle,  
And being latent feel thyself no less?

It is a fine test of life. And the best way for us to meet these temptations to grow cynical and inactive, the surest help against the pressure of the middle part of life, is to look to Jesus who Himself passed through the ordeal in front of us. Even out of these troubles and trials God can make materials for faith. He can use them to make us more thoughtful, more humble, and more sympathetic. And, as we acquire these qualities, we are advancing steadily in all that faith means for a fruitful life.

3. Then, towards the end, there is *the difficulty of death*. At the best life is an easily measured quantity, and often it is prematurely cut short by accident or disease. It would be morbid to be thinking of this often, for life, not death, is our concern. But sometimes a thoughtful person must face the fact. When a man insures his life, for example, he is told the number of years upon which normally he is entitled to count. At a death in his family, he is reminded again of the brevity of his days. Death defeats many a plan and purpose. And the question rises for faith: Does death defeat everything? Does it defeat even what God purposes in us? The answer of faith is, 'No.' When we reduce the question to its simplest elements, it comes to this: 'What is the last reality in the world? Is it God or death? Which of these two powers is the stronger?' Faith tries to answer, sometimes with a tremor in its voice, 'God! It must be God.'

We read that it had been revealed to Simeon of old that he should not see death till he had seen the Lord's Christ. And that revelation is made to us. We get our vision, our revelation of what Jesus is; then, in the light of that, we can see death truly without exaggerating it. This is the order of experience. First, the conception of all that Jesus means for life; then the sight and experience of death. How real death is we know. It strips and empties life for us repeatedly. But, as we see Jesus, we know that the most real thing in this world or in any other is the faith which holds to God as Jesus

held, and so we learn to take death in its true proportions. To meet it is the last act of faith by which we shall be called upon to honour God.

Many strong Christians have suffered from the fear of death, men like Dr. Johnson, for example. It is partly constitutional, partly due to certain physical conditions. Only, it is the experience of most doctors, nurses, and ministers that the fear of death is not at all common on a deathbed. And this further help is for us, that Jesus Himself encountered the same temptation. He knew the natural shrinking from death.

It is to sustain our faith that we are called to the worship of the Church. Life is difficult for us, and faith sometimes is difficult too. It never can be more difficult for us than it was for Jesus our Lord. But He believed in God, and He gathers us in our fellowship to strengthen faith, 'Let us run the race set before us, looking to him.'<sup>1</sup>

#### ARMISTICE SUNDAY.

##### The Church and the International Mind.

'God . . . hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation.'—2 Co 5<sup>18</sup>.

We do well to remember that the supreme revelation of God to man in Jesus Christ had its roots in national life. To an early patriarch was given the challenging commission, 'I will make of thee a great nation, and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.' The prophets were pre-eminently patriots; it was in no small part their keen insight into national conditions which gave them their unflinching foresight as to the inevitable issue. When, in the fulness of time, Jesus came He was brought into relation with this background of national history. He was the Son of God, but also the Son of David, Israel's king. And Paul, the greatest of His followers, calls himself an 'Hebrew of the Hebrews.'

At a very early date there seems to have sprung into action what one might call the supreme heresy of the ages—the false thinking, namely, that God has favourite children, and we are they. As the years passed, men responded ever more eagerly to the first part of the commission given to Abraham, 'I will make of thee a great nation.' But they forgot the sequel, 'And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.' The Book of Jonah was not written to tell the story of a whale. It was written to make vivid the fact that God's purpose of love embraces the foreigner. Paul had to spend years wrestling with his prejudices in the discipline

<sup>1</sup> J. Moffatt, in *United Free Church Sermons*, 144.



of the desert, Peter had to have a vision from heaven, before either was ready to believe that God's purpose of love concerned any one but the Jew.

With this heresy, which would say, 'Go to, let us build up our own nation,' which asks with the dear old Boston lady, 'Why do not these foreign governments take care of their own people?' a kindred heresy is rife among us, this, namely, that sturdy patriotism and internationalism are mutually exclusive. The very word 'internationalism' is anathema to many excellent people. They rank it with anarchism, socialism, and many other 'isms' which are altogether evil. But the Christian life, that is the life growing into the mind of Christ, is a thing of ever-broadening areas of interest and influence. It begins with the individual, concerned rightly with the development of his own powers and the shaping of his own life. Presently he marries, presently there comes to his home God's most beautiful gift to a man and a woman, a little child. Now he lives for them, thinks of them in all his planning. But because of his new relation he is not less an individual than he was.

Presently he awakens to his duty as a citizen. Perhaps he takes an earnest part in some civic or national movement. But if he be a Christian man in all this he is not less loyal to his family than before. For serving the city, the state, the nation, he is serving the group of families of which his own is one, no one of which can have safety, health, education, fulness of life, save in those civic and national conditions for which, with all his soul, he is at work.

So the patriot is the man who has the broadest vision of his country's task and the most eager passion to make it real, the man who, if he say, 'my country first,' means it first in national honour and diplomatic fair dealing, first in bringing its mighty resources to the service of humanity, first in daring adventures in peace.

In this era of conferences, in itself a happy omen, we do well to realize that world peace will never come through the action of governments or through conferences, however good, save as these register the insistent and persistent decisions of peoples. We do well to realize, too, that there will be no lasting peace among the nations until there is peace in the nations with God.

Here is where the individual counts tremendously. In this business of world peace, what can the individual do?

1. We can each of us contribute one life of goodwill to the world. King, president, statesman,

general, can do no more. The great sources of war are those described in the fourth chapter of the General Epistle of James. The trouble is that our so-called peace is so much like war. Every broken home, every severed friendship, every cherished antipathy, every persistent breach between employer and employé, every failure of men and women who call themselves Christians to live together in mutual sympathy and service, is as a blazing torch thrown into the stored dynamite of the world's hatreds. It is our contribution to the insanity of states.

2. We can each of us contribute one conciliatory and interpretative mind to public opinion which is the ultimate force in a democracy. That is a mind which, though staunch in its own carefully considered positions, yet recognizes that truth is a many-sided thing, that antagonistic interests are usually a phase of short-sightedness; a mind which habitually projects itself into the other man's mind, to learn, if one can, how things look at his angle, eager to find the point of contact, ready as far as one consistently can to revise one's thinking to that end. It would be difficult to find a more pathetic public document in recent years than the statement sent from the White House by the late President Harding, himself a master of conciliation, when a general railroad strike was threatened. The pathetic thing was that, knowing the men concerned, the President should feel compelled to say, 'Recognizing that the labour group and also the managing group are in the nature of things partisans of the respective elements which they represent, the President felt that it was unnecessary to invite these two groups (into conference to which the representatives of the public were invited), because their attitude would necessarily be partisan in any consideration of wage questions.' When will our public men learn not merely that no one knows a subject who knows only one side, but that no man is a wise champion of any interest until he is sensitively fair to the other?

3. We can each of us support the agencies of goodwill at work in the world. Chief among these is the Church of Christ, whose business is the ministry of reconciliation. And chief among the activities of the Church in the interest of world peace is the work of the foreign missionary, whose task is by word and life to interpret the nations to each other: magnificent the work he has done and is doing to this end.

4. We can each of us pray for world peace, and there is nothing which needs more constantly and more earnestly to be done by all men of goodwill.

For prayer, let us remember, is not a formula, it is a life. It is not merely petition, it is a covenant and a programme. One cannot offer the Lord's prayer sincerely without becoming a daring adventurer in the world of goodwill. Our most constant and persistent prayer may well be that of Elisha. As we think to-day of the young men and women who are to be the makers of the new world, as with ever-broadening horizon we think of the multitudes confused by false values, sheep without a shepherd, shall we not pray with the prophet, 'Lord, open the eyes of the young man that he may see; Lord, open the eyes of all the

peoples of the world that they may see.' Then in the records of eternity it may be written as of old, 'And the Lord opened their eyes, and they saw. And behold the mountains were full of horses and chariots of fire round about'—the invisible but invincible resources that are ever theirs whose hands are in the hand of the living God. 'Some trust in chariots and some in horses, but we will remember the name of the Lord our God.'

I to the hills will lift mine eyes  
From whence doth come mine aid.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. MacColl, *The Sheer Folly of Preaching*, 98.

## Psychology of the Presentation of the Gospels.

BY PRINCIPAL THE REVEREND A. DAKIN, B.D., D.TH., BAPTIST COLLEGE, BRISTOL.

PSYCHOLOGY is a word that finds a ready entrance into the minds of men to-day. The subject makes a wide appeal. Consequently it is exploited by all kinds of people and for all sorts of ends. And being exploited it is inevitably distorted, so that it is difficult to say what the situation at the moment is. Much that goes by the name is certainly not above the level of quackery, and in no realm is it easier to play the quack than in this science of strange terms and abstract ideas. Clearly it is a good deal easier to draw conclusions than to analyse the mind, and for one who is analysing the mind there are many drawing conclusions.

It is well to remember that science always begins with facts. The work of the Psychologist is to get at the facts of mental life. One would naturally imagine that the mind being nearest to us would be quite easy to read. But only a little experience is sufficient to reveal that the facts here are exceedingly difficult to come at; more difficult even than in the realm of physical science. But until the facts are clearly established dogmatism is out of place.

The final end of Psychology is to give us a complete understanding of the human mind. The science would show us the mind in its various activities; it would teach us all that can be known about mental structure: in a word, it would make us know the world within, as in the last few centuries we have come to know the world without. That is its final end. But that end is as yet a very long way off, and one can confidently predict that there

will be much statement and re-statement, many tentative hypotheses, and not a little confusion before anything like certainty is reached. We are still very near the beginning.

This is a point that at the present stage must not be forgotten. In no science is it easier to mistake theories for facts; and in no science is it easier to draw conclusions from the part, ignoring the whole. In reading books on Psychology one often notices that tendency. The writer fastens on one or two manifestations, and, while discussing these, often conveniently ignores others. He sees the mind not as a whole, but as it were in section. But what seems true when only a section of the mind is visualized may be quite false in relation to the whole. It is the complexity of the mind that baffles, and it is the simplification for purposes of psychological discussion that so often leads astray. Thus we frequently get elaborate explanations for very simple phenomena, and on the other hand very simple formulæ as explanations of very involved processes. This in part accounts for the picturesque results we are getting. Psychology is called on to explain everything. Every pathological state as well as every normal state is laid bare. Almost every type of being—the saint, the sinner in all his varieties, the Old Testament prophet, the modern minister of the gospel, even Jesus Himself—all are explained, if not dismissed, by the use of an appropriate formula, sometimes by a single word. The prophet, for example, is ecstatic, and John Bunyan is an 'introvert.' But often these are



mere words which serve as shrouds to embalm our ignorance. And probably there is no greater enemy of truth than impressive ignorance. If you take a book of psychology by an Anglo-Catholic, you find that psychological theory justifies the Confessional and the whole scheme of Anglo-Catholic ritual and devotion. On the other side, a book by a Free Churchman tells a totally different tale. In similar manner one uses the science to establish and support religion, another to do away with religion altogether. Surely no clearer proof could be found of the fact that we are not getting accurate and dispassionate scientific statement, but only too often the reading back of existing prejudices into the study of mental phenomena. There is the difficulty: the mind is a great deep, so complex that we can easily read into it what we will. And the temptation all along the line is to impose a theory, rather than draw out the theory from the patient observance of the facts. Much good work is being done, and some things have been discovered in recent years, but no man has yet reached down to the depths. The great mystery of human personality has not been penetrated. We require a much more radical and thorough analysis.

This leads me to say that there is no need for us yet to throw over the great deliverances of Christian experience at the bidding of the new psychology. In the realm of religion men have been converted; they have found a new hope and a new power; their lives have been changed and redeemed to finer issues; prayer has wrought wonders, and even the message of the Hebrew prophets has stood and still stands—light in our darkness. Psychology may illumine all these manifestations. It may make us wiser when we speak of these things. It may show us the way to utilize hitherto unsuspected forces for the furtherance of human good. But as yet it has not wiped out all this as mere illusion, nor has it invalidated the distinctively Christian explanation. It is far too early yet to cut such a phrase as 'the grace of God' out of our vocabulary. The idea that so-called religious experience is not genuine experience and that it has no relation to any reality outside ourselves is non-proven. It still belongs to the realm of theory. On the other hand, a changed life is a fact, and the Church possesses many such facts. These weigh heavy in the scale. And such facts still have power to stimulate men to preach the gospel, believing that it can be one of the most vital elements in the development of personality. Shall we continue to present the gospel? There is nothing even in the new psychology which would warrant us to cease.

But is there any longer a gospel to present? There are psychologists who reduce man to a mere bundle of instincts with certain inevitable reactions. They see him as the plaything of forces within, just as formerly he was thought of as a cork on the waters without. That is to say, they interpret man on the determinist theory. Prayer is only the influence of one complex on another, conversion just the turning over of the mind, and the very idea of God is but 'the self-painting of the yearning spirit.' It is the old mechanistic view of the universe coming one stage nearer to us, and it is very significant that this view should be entrenching itself in psychology just at the time when it seems to be weakening in the realm of physics. That it is a challenge to faith none will deny. But, as in the past, we are not wrong in emphasizing the great facts of religious and Christian experience. We maintain that these facts have their place in any theory of life that claims to be final. The moral sense of man, his deep-seated feeling of moral responsibility, the needs of his spirit and their satisfaction in religion, all this and a good deal more must be not merely pushed aside but explained. And while we are wrestling with the problem and seeking the explanation, we shall not forget that life is bigger than theory, man is more than any formula, the mind is greater than even the sum total of its sentiments and complexes. Even the growing boy is far bigger than all that has yet been written on the subject of adolescence.

Thus we ought not to depart too readily from the lines laid down by experience. One has a fear lest in the work of presenting the gospel psychological theory should come to take the place of that spirit of sympathy and love which in the past has been our greatest asset. There is such a thing as knowing men without much knowledge of technical psychology, and at the present time, at least, I would rather trust the knowledge that comes by contact than a mere acquaintance with psychological principles. In the Sunday School we make a bad bargain when we get rid of the *mother* spirit and substitute for it the touch of the mere theorist. And the preacher who relies more on McDougall's *Social Psychology* than on visiting his people is in real danger of putting theory in the seat of reality. There is an insight which is the outcome of love, and that insight is yet the surest guide to the needs of men and to the mode of presenting the gospel.

However, in all this, there is no wish to disparage the new psychology, still less to encourage the attitude of ignoring it. New discoveries un-

doubtedly have been made, and in the realm of healing especially remarkable results have followed the use of new methods. The psycho-analyst has his place to-day as one of our helpers. These results alone are sufficient to start in our minds many questions, and we can hardly escape one that is fundamental. Will the new psychology give us a different emphasis in our method and message? Quite possibly it will. It can scarcely leave us where we are. There is much to assimilate, and when we have assimilated it, we shall be different. But how different? In what points, and in what way? As yet it is too early to form a judgment. Psychology at the present stage raises questions, and we see at once that those questions are vital. They concern us. But for the answers to many of those questions we have still to wait.

Take miracle, for example. Some have heartily welcomed the new discoveries in the healing art, as throwing light on the miracles of Jesus. They have seen here the removal of one of the great stumbling-blocks in the way of faith. So they have argued psychology is making things easier. But is it? The drift of much of the new psychology is to do away not only with miracle but with the supernatural altogether. It may make Jesus intelligible on the one side, but it will raise a very difficult problem concerning His personality on the other. A Jesus who can heal the sick in a world where there is no God will not be easier for the Church to assimilate than the Christ of the Gospels. Psychology may solve for us the problem of miracle, but what if it raises the greater problem of our Lord's consciousness of God in a new and acute form?

So with the doctrine of grace. All this talk about complexes and their power in the subconscious, this talk about suggestion and the helplessness of the will, and the doctrine of reversed effort as it is called—what is this but a re-establishing of the old emphasis on grace and grace alone as the power of redemption? It seems to support the old-fashioned revivalist with his cry: 'Give up striving and only believe.' But again, on the other hand, we know what some types of psychology make of Divine grace. There is no such thing. Conversion is just the activity of strange elements in the personality, and what we call 'monuments of grace' they regard as merely interesting specimens of abnormality.

The point is this. In the present deliverances there are some things that seem to support the Church. There is much, on the other hand, that makes against it. We have to re-think it all again. But the re-thinking is a long process. And mean-

while we wait for a more thorough analysis and for the testing of the theories by the sum total of the facts of life.

Two points in concluding. One is that the mind is a very delicate organism. Obviously it is open to influences from the earliest days, and these influences have effect long after the experience has passed; nay, it may be after the experience is forgotten. Clearly, then, the mind must be treated very respectfully and very wisely. Any sort of sledge-hammer treatment is almost criminal, and above all else shock must be avoided. That raises questions for us. What ideas shall we present? And at what age? And by what means? But it also raises the question of the child's home. More damage may be done in an hour in the home than all the good that can be done in Church and Sunday School in a month. In the same way, it raises the question of the conditions in which grown men must live and work. If, for example, warfare as it exists to-day causes shock and creates mental disturbances and insanity, it is not merely the mind of man that is at fault, it is war itself that is wrong. In future we must learn increasingly to see both children and adults in their setting in life. The environment is part of the problem. We are concerned with people, not merely with 'souls.' In a word, psychology is adding its weight to the modern emphasis on the necessity for good homes and right working conditions and an environment that is altogether favourable to mental health.

The next point is that the presentation of the gospel may well be our contribution to mental stability. Just now we are talking about the complex—its existence and its effects. Sooner or later we shall have to talk about its origin. How comes it to be in the personality, and once there by what means does it grow and become active? In other words, are there any means of *preventing* the development of those elements which cause the disturbance? Here our Lord's testimony is very interesting. According to Jesus apparently the great sin is *self-deceit*. His one cry on the ethical side was: *Be sincere and honest within*. He condemned wilful blindness, the turning away from the light, and hypocrisy and the refusal to shoulder such common obligations as that of service to others. So psychology is teaching us that it is the fear not faced, the wrong not acknowledged that being repressed may later give rise to trouble. What if people should learn to be brave, honest, sincere with themselves all along the line during the development of personality? We cannot say that there would then be no mental breakdown.



But we can say that this is the way to prevention, and prevention is better than a cure.

To help people along that line is a worthy task. The organization of the mind is the important thing, and in the organization of the mind sentiments play a very considerable part. It may well be that for the right organization of the mind a strong *religious* sentiment, with God the Father as its centre and Jesus Christ His interpreter, is the great necessity that men may be kept whole

every whit. In other words, a right religion in a right environment is the way to mental stability and health.

Believing in God as we do on other grounds than psychological, appreciating as we do the great facts of Christian experience and with Christian history in mind, we may still, I think, repeat the words of a great psychologist of earlier days :

'O God, Thou hast made us for Thyself and our souls are restless till they rest in Thee.'

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### The Problem of God.

IN this book<sup>1</sup> a Protestant theologian discusses critically and appreciatively the important contribution of a Roman Catholic philosopher, M. Edouard Le Roy, on the above subject. The Introduction offers a very generous welcome to this book on three grounds, 'the authority of its author, the place it holds in the history of modern thought, and the grandeur of the subject with which it deals' (p. 2). An exposition is followed by a statement of agreement and of difference. And on the basis of this review the author gives a complementary development of the subject itself. It is impossible to summarize the summary given of M. Le Roy's work. Suffice it to say that an original exposition of the nature of God is based on Bergson's philosophy. A comparison is next made of the matters in which French Protestant theology finds its confirmation, and those in which the Roman Catholic affinities of the writer are disclosed. The Kantian basis of much Protestant theology is severely criticised as separating by an unbridgable gulf the subject and the object of the religious consciousness. M. Ménégoz himself welcomes warmly the philosophy of *phenomenology*, of which the German thinker, Husserl, is the most eminent representative. 'Whether we are concerned,' he says, 'with philosophy or theology the enemy at the present hour is "subjectivism," more exactly subjectivism "psychologist" or "historicist." Chargeable, more or less, to the isolating epistemology of Kant, this "subjectivism" has become as intolerable to our generation as a hundred years

ago was its antithesis the "objectivism" massive, intangible, and indigestible of diverse orthodoxies. Now to put an end to a situation, from which there seemed to be no outlet, phenomenology submits to a complete revision even the bases of philosophy, and on a new foundation it essays to bestow on thinking men what they have hitherto lacked, a "theory of the object"' (p. 21). The *intentionalism* of this new philosophy means this, that 'every act of knowledge reveals itself, by its very essence, a movement to an object which transcends it.' It is a consciousness of Something. Experience is intercourse with objects. Religious knowledge by its very nature has God as its object. From this standpoint Protestant theology can go beyond Kantian separation, and get nearer to the tendencies of the Roman Catholic philosopher, who, abandoning intellectualism, offers a philosophy and theology of *life*. 'God is accessible and cognizable only by an intuition, more exactly, the religious intuition, or, what comes to the same thing, by an "experience," and an experience unique of its kind, the religious experience' (p. 29). Religion and morality are here inseparable. 'I wish the best, hence I am ; and because, in this willing, there is affirmed the will of God acting, spite of me, in me, God is'—this is M. Le Roy's argument for the existence of God. Other points of resemblance must be passed over. But there are also differences. His Bergsonism leads M. Le Roy to a statement such as this : 'God is known to us by His very life in us, in the labour of our very deification in this sense, one can again say that for us, God is not, but becomes. His becoming is our progress' (p. 45). M. Ménégoz rejects this identification of the reality of God with the religious process in man. Again, in opposition to the philosopher's mystical tend-

<sup>1</sup> *Réflexions sur le Problème de Dieu*, par Fernand Ménégoz. (Paris : Librairie Félix Alcan, 1931, pp. 124. 7 francs.)

ency, the movement of the temporal to the eternal, he emphasizes the evangelical, sin seeking forgiveness. A Catholic feature is discovered in the entire subordination of the individual in the society. These are only a few of the instances of the acute criticism from the Protestant standpoint of the Roman Catholic philosopher.

In the second half of the book the author passes from criticism to construction; and he gives his own solution of the problem of God from the standpoint of this phenomenological philosophy, a philosophy of which our theology should seek a fuller knowledge. The subject discovers the object in itself, or rather the object discloses itself in the subject. In other words, man's religion is possible only by God's revelation. A characteristic sentence may be quoted: 'In short, if it is true that religious knowledge is gained by the deepening of man's knowledge in being pervaded progressively by the knowledge of God, one will reach this conclusion that all religious thought is in fact, not the original thought of man, but indeed a thought of God rethought by man' (pp. 92-93). Rejecting the Kantian separation of God and man and the Bergsonian identification of God with man, this author's phenomenological philosophy enables him to preserve the difference and the unity alike. The interest of the volume lies not only in the comparison of Protestant and Roman Catholic theology, but in the contrasts of these three philosophies in their bearing on theology.

The book contains a great deal more than I have been able to indicate; but I have tried to throw into bold relief not only what has interested me most, but what seems to me most important for the more fundamental thinking in theology, which seems to me to be a crying need of our churches. I, therefore, heartily recommend the book for careful study.

---

### Contemporary Paganism.

THE triple number (March, April, May) of *Le Christianisme Social* is of quite exceptional interest and importance. It is really a book of about two hundred and forty pages on one subject in its many varied aspects. The treatment, after the Editorials (E. G.'s Definition of Paganism, Gustave Monod's note on the word Paganism, and Albert Finet's identification of paganism with the natural man) falls into four parts—paganism of the natural and paganism of the supernatural type,

the origins of this paganism and conclusions to be drawn regarding it. Among the principal forms of western paganism are mentioned popular western paganism (A. Ducasse), old paganism in contemporary French literature (Ch. Clerc), a visit to the Wellcome Museum, London (Frank Christol), healings by touch (X). Then follow some types of modern idolatry—the idolatry of the body (A. Sujol), the Worship of Mammon and the spirit of poverty (Elie Gunelle), note on Marxist paganism (Elie Gunelle), the Worship of the State (Edmond Dumeril), the triumph of mechanized matter (Pierre Terel), and a Satire on the flesh (a poem against the adoration of Venus by Calogero Banavia). The types of supernaturalist paganism, mainly in the bosom of the Church, which are mentioned are Catholic paganism (Eric Dardel), the pagan tendencies in Protestantism (Henry Laenhardt), the paganism in Protestant Thought (Charles Lelièvre). Two essays are offered in explanation: one deals with 'Christian' paganism (Franz Laenhardt), and the other discusses the philosophy of the contemporary paganism. In the Conclusions Ch. Bast gives a sketch of the condemnation of Catholic idolatry by the early Protestants, and the editor (Elie Gunelle) opposes to these modern idols what he calls Christian Humanism.

It is manifestly impossible to discuss all the essays, all excellent in their kind. Only a few points can be noted. 'The first kind of paganism is above all due to the *positivist* spirit which does not want to know, love, adore, and serve anything but nature, the cosmic forces, and to-day especially mechanized matter, the method, the result, the body, money, reason, man, the State, Society. What most of all characterizes this paganism is anti-spirituality. Materialist, it extinguishes the stars, Rationalist, it admits only the realities and the verities on which a so-called positive science sets its seal, and as regards all else attaches an agnosticism polite or brutal. Humanist, it puts humanity in the place of God, humanity under any aspect; the individual, society, class, race, State, when it is not simply an idolatry of self. The second kind of paganism, that of the supernaturalist type, is a very complex mysticism, which is not, or does not believe itself to be contrary to spirituality, even although this mysticism does not cease to materialize the spirit, to mingle its pagan magic with the Christian supernatural, and at last to oppose itself to the Spirit of Christ, even and especially when it succeeds in clothing its idolatries and superstitions in the



forms, rites, and the dogmas of evangelicalism' (p. 265).

It is curious that a French pastor has disclosed to a resident for many years in London that in the Wellcome Museum there is a collection of exhibits of manifold forms of modern superstition. Distinguishing five aspects of human activity—the physical, the psychic (impression, effect, expression), the psychological (conception, judgment, reasoning), the moral, and the spiritual, the writer on pagan tendencies in Protestantism discovers paganism wherever there is any subordination, or even co-ordination of the spiritual to the other aspects. 'Every attempt,' he says, 'to make human art, virtue, or knowledge spiritual values, is a veritable corruption of the spiritual, and constitutes a form of paganism. The spiritual finds itself changed in the measure in which the inferior orders become important and the paganization of a spiritual religion consists in a reduction of the spiritual to any one of these orders' (p. 387). The editor in a note indicates his dissent from this opposition of the moral to the spiritual, and points out that the writer includes saintliness, the moral dynamic in the spiritual. A moralism only which excludes relation to God may be taxed with paganism. Following in the footsteps of Alexander Vinet, the author of the essay on Paganism in Protestant Thought finds it wherever 'the Gospel remains unknown, and revives in the bosom of the Christian Church itself every time when the Gospel is no longer the unique norm of the life, the worship, and the thought of Christians' (p. 403).

The editor Elie Gounelle writes the longest, and in some ways the most interesting essay. To the purely humanist or rationalist method on the one hand, and to a theocratic and dogmatic method (the Barthian) on the other, he opposes the synthetic method, a Christian Humanism. 'The secret of liberation from our idols and all our sins is a conversion to a human God, thanks to a Christ human and divine, and in view of a human Kingdom of God' (p. 505), for 'to be born of God is to be born for humanity' (p. 507). I find myself in almost entire agreement with this broad-minded, large-hearted, essentially evangelical, yet comprehensively liberal theology. The essays are not only interesting as making us familiar with conditions in France, but they are important as dealing with problems which touch us in Great Britain also, as this contemporary paganism is a world-wide challenge of the Christian gospel.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

## Varia.

A PECULIAR pathos attaches to Aaron Ember's *Egypto-Semitic Studies*,<sup>1</sup> as the writer, in the endeavour to rescue his MS. from a conflagration which cost the lives of his wife and his youngest child, lost his own life. Only a fraction of the original MS. was recovered, but this has been carefully copied by Miss Frida Behnk, herself a Semitic scholar and a pupil of Erman's, and it is now published under the above title. The thesis to which these studies are devoted is thus described by the writer: 'The Egyptian language is essentially Semitic both from a lexicographical as well as from a grammatical (especially in regard to its syntax) point of view. It appears that by no less than eighty-five per cent. of the words in old Egyptian are Semitic. There are, of course, important differences, but, to my mind, they are not greater than we should expect them to be when we consider the fact that Egyptian must have separated from the common Semitic stock thousands of years before the beginning of history, and from that remote period their language had a development of its own, almost entirely independent of the other Semitic languages.' Briefly his aim was 'to determine and exemplify the phonetic relations which obtain between Egyptian and the other Semitic languages,' and the illustrations, in alphabetic order, copied by Miss Behnk in beautiful script, run to one hundred and eighteen pages. The following brief extract will give an idea of the method—'prî "come out, come forth, rise," whence *pr. t.* "fruit, seed" = Heb. *p̄rî* "fruit," Heb. *pārā* and Arab. *ḡafara* "be numerous, fruitful" are denominatives. The orig. signification of the stem is preserved in Eth. *ḡafara* "come out, go out." Professor Kurt Sethe, who writes a sympathetic foreword, while regarding many of Ember's suggested analogies between Egyptian and Semitic as 'audacious and highly problematical,' yet admits that there are many happy and instructive ones among them. The *Egypto-Semitic Phonetic Vocabulary* is prefaced by a Bibliography on *Egypto-Semitic Relationship*, beginning with Benfey's book, *Ueber des Verhältniss der ägyptischen Sprache zum semitischen Sprachstamm*. While the Preface is in German, the actual *Studies* are in English, and published under the auspices of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation.

Much of the opposition to the critical view of the Pentateuch is due to sheer ignorance; but this

<sup>1</sup> Verlag Asia Major G.M.B.H., Leipzig, C.1; Mk. 10.

cannot be said of the exhaustive volume of Pastor Wilhelm Möller,<sup>1</sup> who is best known in this country by his book on 'Are the Critics Right?' It contains four hundred and eighty closely printed pages and is written with full knowledge of all that the latest criticism has to say about the structure and origin of the Pentateuch. The title of the Book, 'The Unity and Authenticity of the Five Books of Moses,' is significant of its purpose, which is to defend the traditional view that the Pentateuch is Mosaic and therefore not composite, as the critics allege. He deals in detail with all the phenomena that have driven the critics to a belief in its compositeness—the doublets, the repetitions, the contradictions, the different names of Deity, and in general the differences in vocabulary, the differences in theological conceptions which accompany these differences, the occasional prophecies which the critics, who regard them as *vaticinia post eventum*, make use of to determine the date, etc. etc. Möller devotes much of his energy to answering Sellin, who has written what is perhaps the most popular Introduction to the Old Testament to-day, but he is particularly grieved with König, who in other than literary matters tends to be conservative. He takes note of Yahuda's work on the Pentateuch and warmly welcomes it as corroborating and supplementing his own conclusions. He makes clever play with the extraordinary divergences among the critics, with the uncertainty which attaches to many of the 'assured results,' and with the strangely inconsistent rôles which have to be assigned to the redactors, who sometimes treat the component documents with great respect and at other times with astonishing freedom. The whole discussion is preceded by an interesting piece of autobiography in which Möller traces his passage from enthusiastic reception of the critical position to vehement rejection of it. But there are many others whose experience has been the very reverse—who have passed from the traditional view which tended to breed in them scepticism, to the critical view which, despite all its difficulties, has made the Bible a more living and believable book. Möller's book is as powerful and well-informed a defence of the conservative position as we are ever likely to have and, as such, deserves more careful consideration from critical scholars than his previous books have received.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

## Criticism and Preaching.<sup>2</sup>

It is twenty-five years since Dr. Lietzmann started his 'Handbuch zum Neuen Testament,' which has proved so successful. It was intended to be purely scientific, not homiletical or expository. But the editor now confesses that he is alive to a further need, the need of preventing historical and literary criticism from being indifferent to theological and practical interests in the churches. 'Our Church needs Biblical preaching more than ever,' he declares. In a candid preface he acknowledges that it would be a pity if the critical study of the New Testament made it impossible to use Scripture in preaching, and therefore Dr. Leonhardt Fendt of Berlin has been commissioned to show how modern criticism may be employed honestly and effectively in the pulpit. The pericopes were sections of the Bible to be used as lessons in public worship, two for each Sunday, one from the Gospels and the other from the Epistles. The only Old Testament pericopes were Is 60<sup>1-6</sup> which followed Mt 2 on Epiphany, Is 53 which was read on Good Friday, and Ps 145<sup>15-21</sup> which followed Lk 12<sup>15-21</sup>. Dr. Fendt's method is to explain both passages in a pericope on the critical lines of the *Handbuch* and then to discuss their liturgical connexion, which is not always apparent. This is done with a concern for preaching, however. 'Christentum ist Christum,' he begins by saying. The New Testament rose out of the primitive preaching, and the core of that preaching was belief in Jesus as the Christ of God. How this came about and how still preachers can repeat this message, is the problem which Dr. Fendt faces. He is wonderfully successful in handling the material. He writes for German ministers; apart from a few references to the Dictionaries of Dr. Hastings, the literary allusions are almost entirely German. But any who use Lietzmann's *Handbuch* will find profit in this part of it. The aim is excellent, the spirit of the book is genuinely religious, and such an effort to rescue preaching from discussions of passing events and to revive expository preaching on the basis of thoroughgoing modern exegesis, is to be welcomed heartily in any language. It does make demands upon the preacher; he must know his New Testament thoroughly, and he must be frank as well as reverent. But, as Dr. Fendt shows, there is heat as well as light in criticism, if it be used on the lines indicated by this monograph.

New York.

JAMES MOFFATT.

<sup>1</sup> *Die Einheit und Echtheit der 5 Bücher Moses* (Selbstverlag des Bibelbundes, Bad Salzungen; Mk. 15, br.; 17.50 geb.).

<sup>2</sup> *Die Alten Pericopen*, by Dr. Leonhardt Fendt, in 'Handbuch zum Neuen Testament,' 22 (Mohr, Tübingen; M. 9).



## Contributions and Comments.

### The Sumerio-Babylonian Origin of the Legend of Adam.

THE Sumerian legend of *Adapa*, *Adapa* is preserved in Babylonian texts only. In chap. iv. pp. 175-189 of my *Semitic Mythology* the great similarity of the Babylonian and Hebrew legends of Adapa and Adam has been discussed in detail. In both legends man lost eternal life by the misadventure of Adapa or Adam. The derivation of the Hebrew legend from the Babylonian has been suggested chiefly on two grounds: (i) the similarity of the two names; (ii) the fact that a large portion of the Adapa legend has been found in the Canaanitish cuneiform correspondence with the kings of Egypt, in the archives of Tel-al-Amarna; the texts found in the Egyptian archives are annotated in red ink as though they had been the subject of careful study. It is evident, therefore, that the legend of Adapa was well known in Canaan before the Mosaic period. As to the similarity of the names, Professor Sayce gave a reason for actually reading the name *Adapa* as *Adamu*. See my *Le Poème Sumérien du Paradis*, p. 127, n. 2.

Although it has been generally conceded that the peculiar form in which the legend of the Fall of Man has been presented in the Hebrew of Genesis is based upon the older Babylonian legend, there are so many fundamental divergences (all of which have been discussed in ch. iv. of *Semitic Mythology*) that this theory has not been entirely accepted by Old Testament scholars. The final evidence that Adapa and Adam are one and the same is now at hand. Professor Meissner, *Beiträge zum Assyrischen Wörterbuch* (Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago), p. 78, line 20, has published a syllabary in which the Sumerian word *a-da-ap* is explained by *amēlu*, man. *Amēlu* is the Babylonian translation of Sumerian *adap*, originally *adapad*, *adapa*. The Babylonian word for 'man,' *amēlu*, *awēlu*, means 'the trembling,' 'the flickering one,' 'the transient.' This, then, is the meaning of the Sumerian hero of Eridu. Adapa the sage, who lost eternal life at the gates of heaven by refusing to drink the water of life and to eat the bread of life offered him by Anu in high heaven. The legend employs the word 'man' for the name of that ancestor whose blunder brought mortality upon mankind.

Now, although I still do not see how Adapa(d) can

be read as Adamu, it is clear that *Adam* is only a Hebrew translation of *Adapa*, or the Babylonian *amēlu*. *Adapa* is explained in the Babylonian text by *zi-ir amēlūti*, 'seed of mankind,' i.e. of human offspring, and referred to as *amēlūtu la banītu*, 'the unclean human.' In Sumerian, Babylonian, and Hebrew, the respective words, *adapa*, 'amēlu', 'adām', are generic words for 'man,' the human, as distinguished from gods on the one hand and animals on the other. Since both Babylonian and Hebrew versions of the Fall of Man employ a generic term 'man' for the hero of the legend, it is clear that the Hebrew legend of Adam is derived directly from the poem of Adapa of Eridu.

S. LANGDON.

Oxford.

—♦—

‘Touch me not; for I am not yet  
ascended unto the Father’  
(St. John xx. 17).

THIS is one of the few verses in the New Testament which it has been proposed to change by conjectural emendation. The verse is difficult: the words 'touch me not,' or, better, 'do not keep clinging to me,' are clear: it is the second half of the verse which is obscure: it is difficult to see what the words 'I am not yet ascended unto the Father' mean, as a reason for the command 'do not keep clinging to me.' They have been explained as:

- (a) Do not hold me back from my passage to the Father whence I can send the Spirit, nor delay to carry out your proper work;
- (b) do not cling to me, as if things were to be as when I was on earth: I go to my Father, and the approach to me must be by spiritual worship (W. Lock, in S.P.C.K. Commentary).

This explanation makes excellent sense, and states an important truth, but it is difficult to see how it is to be got out of the words 'for I am not yet ascended unto the Father.' On the same day on which our Lord forbade Mary Magdalene to touch Him because 'things were not to be as when he was on earth,' He asked the disciples to touch Him (Lk 24<sup>39</sup>; cf. also Jn 20<sup>27</sup>). Moreover, the words

'not yet ascended' assert that He was yet on this earth, that He had not left it. As He did not leave this earth finally until forty days later, in no real sense could Mary be said to be delaying His passage to the Father by holding Him. And if the explanation mentioned is correct, we should expect instead of 'have *not* yet ascended,' 'I have ascended,' and because that is so, do not cling to me, for things cannot be now as when I was on earth: the approach to me must now be by spiritual worship.

It has been proposed to change *μὴ ἄπτου* into *μὴ πτόου*, *i.e.* 'do not be afraid.' This emendation is ingenious, and it may be right: it gives excellent sense, and is supported by what we are told the feelings of those were at first to whom our Lord appeared after His Resurrection, *e.g.* Lk 24<sup>37</sup>. But they, *i.e.* the disciples, were terrified and affrighted *πτοηθέντες καὶ ἔμφοβοι γινόμενοι*, and supposed that they had seen a Spirit. Cf. also Mt 28<sup>10</sup>, Mk 16<sup>8</sup>. Mary Magdalene was also afraid when our Lord appeared to her: she also thought He was a spirit, and it was to calm her fear that He said, *μὴ πτόου*, 'do not be afraid, for I have not yet ascended to the Father,' *i.e.* I am not a spirit as you think me to be (cf. Archbishop Bernard, *St. John* in 'International Critical Commentary'). This emendation is tempting: if it is accepted the

meaning of the verse is clear, and the sense good. But it is a conjecture. All the MSS give *μὴ ἄπτου*, and why should a simple and easy reading be changed into one which is difficult? = '*proclivi lectioni praestat ardua.*'

Keeping *μὴ ἄπτου*, another explanation is possible. Mary Magdalene did not expect to see our Lord. When He suddenly, and unexpectedly appeared, in her joy and excitement she flung herself at His feet, grasped them and continued to hold them: she would not let them go: she feared our Lord might leave her: she wished to detain Him. And it was to remove that fear that our Lord said, *μὴ ἄπτου*, 'do not keep holding me, there is no need to do so, for I have not yet ascended to the Father,' *i.e.* I do not intend to leave you as yet. I have not yet left this earth, and you will see me again. The following words 'I ascend unto my Father' will then be a *praeseus propheticum*, *i.e.* I have not yet left this earth, but my stay here is short: I shall soon ascend to my Father, and leave this earth finally. Therefore go and tell my brethren: bid them not to delay to come so that they may see me before I do leave this earth: if they delay, they will not see me, as I am soon to ascend to my Father and their Father, and to my God and their God.

W. E. P. COTTER.

Edinburgh.

## Entre Nous.

### THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, 1931-1932.

With this number the magazine enters on its forty-third year, and with the new volume there will be some new features. A general subject of discussion during the year will be 'The Christian Idea of God.' There has been some delay in a series of articles which we promised on 'The Great Attacks on Christianity,' but these will now appear in rapid succession by Professor James Moffatt, Professor W. D. Niven, Mr. Herbert G. Wood, and Professor H. R. Mackintosh. Some special studies of Present-Day Problems will be introduced by a general article on 'The World Crisis and Religion,' by the Bishop of Winchester. In the spring months 'The Barthian School' will be dealt with in four studies on Barth, Brunner, Gogarten, and Bultmann.

### Religious Book Week.

We have pleasure in drawing attention to Religious Book Week which has been arranged by the Committee of the National Book Council to be held from October 11th to 17th. Its object—to promote the reading of religious books—is one to which much space is devoted month by month in this magazine. Just this week we were encouraged by a letter from a Canon in the Church of England who wrote: 'It is the greatest refreshment and help to turn to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, as I do eagerly month by month for guidance as to what is important (and how important) in current theology.'

The sixth resolution of the Lambeth Conference was: 'There is need for the Church to renew and redirect its teaching office by a fresh insistence upon the duty of thinking and learning as essential



elements in the Christian life.' The Committee of the National Book Council have had this affirmation in mind.

We hope to take some further part in the movement by publishing an article in our next issue which will be out earlier in October than usual.

### Negro Sermons in Verse.

In the preface to *God's Trombones* (Allen & Unwin ; 3s. 6d. net), Mr. James Weldon Johnson tells how the idea first came to him of 'fixing' something of the sermons of the old-time American Negro preachers. Mr. Johnson was himself speaking on a certain Sunday in Kansas city in various coloured churches. He had spoken in four, and it was after nine o'clock at night when he was asked to go on to a fifth. As he sat on the platform waiting for his own turn to speak, he heard one of the preachers intone an old folk-sermon which began with the creation of the world and ended with Judgment Day. 'He strode the pulpit up and down in what was actually a very rhythmic dance, and he brought into play the full gamut of his wonderful voice, a voice—what shall I say—not of an organ or a trumpet, but rather of a trombone, the instrument possessing above all others the power to express the wide and varied range of emotions encompassed by the human voice—and with greater amplitude.'

Although this was the incident that gave Mr. Johnson the necessary impetus to turn some of the old folk-sermons into verse, he had known them all from childhood—sermons that pass with only slight modification from preacher to preacher. Those who have heard Mr. Paul Robeson's readings from *God's Trombones* do not need to be told how well he has caught the thought, spirit, and manner of the Negro preacher.

The little volume opens with a prayer—for there was always a preliminary prayer to create the atmosphere. This was given, not by the minister, but by the prayer leader. The third verse—a petition for the minister—is full of primitive and imaginative power:

And now, O Lord, this man of God,  
Who breaks the bread of life this morning—  
Shadow him in the hollow of thy hand,  
And keep him out of the gunshot of the devil.  
Take him, Lord—this morning—  
Wash him with hyssop inside and out,  
Hang him up and drain him dry of sin.

Pin his ear to the wisdom-post,  
And make his words sledge-hammers of truth—  
Beating on the iron heart of sin.  
Lord God, this morning—  
Put his eye to the telescope of eternity,  
And let him look upon the paper walls of  
time.  
Lord, turpentine his imagination,  
Put perpetual motion in his arms,  
Fill him full of the dynamite of thy power,  
Anoint him all over with the oil of thy  
salvation,  
And set his tongue on fire.

Mr. Johnson tells a story of one preacher who after reading a rather cryptic passage, 'took off his spectacles, closed the Bible with a bang, and by way of preface said, "Brothers and sisters, this morning—I intend to explain the unexplainable—find out the undefinable—ponder over the imponderable—and unscrew the inscrutable."' Although the text was often but a starting-point for the sermon, and had little relation to its development, and although the possession of a simple commentary might have made the preacher take a different line, there is a rare knowledge in these sermons of sinful human nature and of the message it needs, and perhaps a little more knowledge would have spoiled the imaginative fervour.

The old-time preacher was an orator, and generally a man far above the average in intelligence. He had his peculiar turns of thought, and distinctive pathos that touch the emotions and aspirations. We might quote from any of the seven sermons—Here are a few verses from the Prodigal Son:

### THE PRODIGAL SON.

Young man—  
Young man—  
Your arm's too short to box with God.

But Jesus spake in a parable, and he said :  
A certain man had two sons.  
Jesus didn't give this man a name,  
But his name is God Almighty.  
And Jesus didn't call these sons by name,  
But ev'ry young man,  
Ev'rywhere,  
Is one of these two sons.

Young man—  
 Young man—  
 Smooth and easy is the road  
 That leads to hell and destruction.  
 Down grade all the way,  
 The farther you travel, the faster you go.  
 No need to trudge and sweat and toil,  
 Just slip and slide and slip and slide  
 Till you bang up against hell's iron gate.

Young man—  
 Young man—  
 You're never lonesome in Babylon.  
 You can always join a crowd in Babylon.  
 Young man—  
 Young man—  
 You can never be alone in Babylon,  
 Alone with your Jesus in Babylon.  
 You can never find a place, a lonesome place,  
 A lonesome place to go down on your knees,  
 And talk with your God, in Babylon.  
 You're always in a crowd in Babylon.

Oh, the women of Babylon !  
 Dressed in yellow and purple and scarlet,  
 Loaded with rings and earrings and bracelets,  
 Their lips like a honeycomb dripping with honey,  
 Perfumed and sweet-smelling like a jasmine flower ;  
 And the jasmine smell of the Babylon women  
 Got in his nostrils and went to his head,  
 And he wasted his substance in riotous living.

#### The Romance of Conversions.

The Rev. William Wakinshaw has been a Methodist preacher for fifty-three years. All through his long life too he has been a successful journalist. *Gleanings from my Life*, just published by The Epworth Press at 3s. 6d. net, is packed with stories of people and events, all recorded in detail in the notebooks without which he never travelled. A considerable part of the volume is occupied with 'The Romance of Conversions.' He recalls that of Mr. James Bibby—whom he had known in his early days—the grandfather of Mr. John Bibby, one of the directors of the large firm of compound cake manufacturers in Liverpool—Messrs. J. Bibby & Sons. Mr. James Bibby, lived as a young man—about eighty years ago—at Quernmore, near

Lancaster. One Sunday evening he walked to the Methodist chapel in Lancaster. 'A local preacher, Midford Atkinson by name, conducted the service. Mr. Bibby was not converted that night. But he was "close upon the shining table-lands."' At this time Mr. Bibby owned the flour mill driven by the Conder. A few nights later 'with no human hand near to guide him, he knelt among the sacks of wheat and bran, cried to Jesus to save him, and was clearly and permanently converted. Always a man of action, he decided to arrange for preaching in his kitchen. Some of the biggest of his household goods were sold to make room for forms and chairs.' But Mr. James Bibby being dead yet speaketh through his family. In an article on Mr. John Bibby in the Methodist Magazine for March 1931, it was shown 'how he and his uncle and the other members of the family who are associated with him in the firm, are striving to embody in all its ramifications the principle of the golden rule. By their considerate treatment of all the three thousand who are on the roll of their staff, they hold an honourable position in the industrial world of England.'

As an example of this considerate treatment, we might tell the following incident (not given in Mr. Wakinshaw's volume). Pressed by a departmental manager to discharge a workman who had been with them some years but who was inefficient, Mr. John Bibby refused. If the man failed to get employment he would deteriorate; if he did get it they would have saddled another firm with a poor and troublesome worker. He was their job and they must see what they could make of him.

A conversion in which Mr. Wakinshaw was personally concerned is described as follows: 'A few years ago I wrote a letter to the *British Weekly*. This revealed me to a lady who knew me when I was at New North Road, thirty years since. Her letter was to tell me the "story of my conversion." She and another girl were present at the Harvest Thanksgiving Service on 14th September 1902, and she writes: "After the first hymn, while you were praying and my head was bowed, I knew with a sudden conviction that God wanted my life and I must not keep Him out of it."'

---

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,  
 and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,  
 Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.